

Middlesex University Research Repository

An open access repository of

Middlesex University research

<http://eprints.mdx.ac.uk>

Blackwell, Richard (2006) Staff development and quality enhancement in higher education.
PhD thesis, Middlesex University. [Thesis]

This version is available at: <https://eprints.mdx.ac.uk/6874/>

Copyright:

Middlesex University Research Repository makes the University's research available electronically.

Copyright and moral rights to this work are retained by the author and/or other copyright owners unless otherwise stated. The work is supplied on the understanding that any use for commercial gain is strictly forbidden. A copy may be downloaded for personal, non-commercial, research or study without prior permission and without charge.

Works, including theses and research projects, may not be reproduced in any format or medium, or extensive quotations taken from them, or their content changed in any way, without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). They may not be sold or exploited commercially in any format or medium without the prior written permission of the copyright holder(s).

Full bibliographic details must be given when referring to, or quoting from full items including the author's name, the title of the work, publication details where relevant (place, publisher, date), pagination, and for theses or dissertations the awarding institution, the degree type awarded, and the date of the award.

If you believe that any material held in the repository infringes copyright law, please contact the Repository Team at Middlesex University via the following email address:

eprints@mdx.ac.uk

The item will be removed from the repository while any claim is being investigated.

See also repository copyright: re-use policy: <http://eprints.mdx.ac.uk/policies.html#copy>

Staff Development and Quality Enhancement in Higher Education

Richard Blackwell

**In partial fulfilment of the regulations of the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy by Public Works**

November 2006

**School of Life Long Learning and Education
Middlesex University**

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	3
List of abbreviations	4
List of tables	5
List of publications submitted (and their short titles)	6
Chapter 1 Introduction	8
Chapter 2 Going with the grain	14
Chapter 3 Managerialism and professionalism	23
Chapter 4 Changing higher education, transforming staff development	32
Chapter 5 Methodological matters	41
Chapter 6 Conclusion	48
References	53
Appendix 1 Details of contributions to publications	58
Appendix 2 Brief summaries of papers submitted	60

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to acknowledge the support that I have received from Steve Egan and the Higher Education Funding Council for England without which I would not have completed this submission while undertaking a full time job. My supervisor, Peter Newby, encouraged me to continue with the project when it would have been easier to give up and provided academic and personal support during the project and writing up process. Monica McLean gave helpful feedback at an important moment and Jacqui Clay provided efficient support through out. My greatest debt is probably to my co-authors and other collaborators who have worked with me over the years, enabling me to clarify and develop my thinking, publish and enhance my practice.

List of Abbreviations

AAHE	American Association for Higher Education
CP	Contextual-Processual (frameworks)
FDTL	Fund for the Development of Teaching and Learning
HE	Higher Education
HE Academy	Higher Education Academy
HEFCE	Higher Education Funding Council for England.
HEI	Higher Education Institution
HR	Human Resources
HRM	Human Resources Management
IT	Information Technology
LTSN	Learning and Teaching Support Network
NCT	National Co-ordination Team (for FDTL projects)
NM	New Managerialism
OD	Organisational development
POT	Peer Observation of Teaching
PTT	Part-time teachers
QE	Quality Enhancement
SD	Staff Development
SEDA	Staff and Educational Development Association
SRHE	Society for Research into Higher Education
TC	Teaching Circles
TQEF	Teaching Quality Enhancement Fund

List of Tables

Table 1: List of publications submitted (and their short titles)	6-7
Shows the short titles used in the text to overcome otherwise numerous, long and confusing references.	
Table 2: Relationship of papers to the core chapters	13
Shows how the themes of the papers and of the core chapters (Chapters 2-4) interrelate.	
Table 3: Contributions to papers by author	59-60
Shows the contribution by the author to all papers, including jointly authored papers.	

Table 1: List of Publications Submitted
(And their short titles as used in the text)

	Refereed Journal Articles	Short title (article/paper)
1	"Peer Observation of Teaching and Staff Development" in Higher Education Quarterly Vol. 50 No. 2 1996, 156-71 (with McLean M)	POT
2	"Mentors for New Academic Staff" in International Journal for Academic Development Vol.1 No.2 1996, 80-5 (with McLean. M)	Mentor 2
3	"Opportunity Knocks? Professionalism and Excellence in University Teaching" in Teachers and Teaching Vol 3 No.1 1997, 85-99 (with McLean M)	Opportunity Knocks?
4	"Teaching Circles: A way forward for part time teachers in Higher Education?" International Journal for Academic Development Vol. 6 No.1 June 2001 40-53 (with Channell J and Wilson J).	Teaching Circles (TC)
5	'Changing Higher Education'. International Journal of Management Education Vol.1 No.3, 2001 4-14 (with David Preece)	Changing HE
6	'Design of an Industrial Engineering Course in an Emerging Economy: Bringing Together Engineering and Educational Approaches'. European Journal of Engineering Education Vol. 27 No.1 113-129 2002 (with Ratchev S and Bonney M)	Bulgarian
7	'Promoting Quality Enhancement in the UK - the experience of collaboration'. Tertiary Education And Management , Vol 11, 55-79 2005 (with Gosling D and D'Andrea V)	Promoting QE
8	'Managing temporary workers in Higher Education - still at the margin?' Personnel Review Vol. 35, No. 2, 207-224 2006 (with Bryson C)	PTT
9	'Strategic Leadership in Academic Development'. Studies in Higher Education Vol. 31, No. 3, 373-387 2006 (with Paul Blackmore)	Strategic Leadership

	Book Chapters.	Short Title (paper)
10	"New Managerialism in the Civil Service" in Mailly R et al (eds) Industrial Relations in the Public Services , Routledge 1989, 68-113 (with Lloyd P)	New managerialism (NM)
11	"Work Based Assessment: The Case of the Graduate Diploma in Employment Relations" in Brown G Assessing Active Learning: Module 11: Effective Teaching and Learning in Higher Education USDTU/CVCP 1992, 83-5	Work Based Assessment
12	"Formal Pupil or Informal Peer?" in Fullerton H (ed) Facets Of Mentoring in Higher Education 1 , SEDA Paper 94 1996, 23-31 (with McLean M)	Mentor 1
13	"Rethinking Strategic Staff Development" in Blackwell R and Blackmore P [eds] Towards Strategic Staff Development , OUP/SRHE, Buckingham 2003 (with Blackmore P)	Rethinking SD
14	"Developing Departments", in Blackwell R and Blackmore P [eds] Towards Strategic Staff Development , OUP/SRHE, Buckingham 2003	Developing Departments
15	"Academic Roles and Relationships" in Blackwell R and Blackmore P [eds] Towards Strategic Staff Development , OUP/SRHE, Buckingham 2003 (with Blackmore P)	Academic Roles
16	"Developing the Subject Dimension of Staff Development" in Blackwell R and Blackmore P [eds] Towards Strategic Staff Development , OUP/SRHE, Buckingham 2003 (with Allan, C and Gibbs, G)	Subject Dimension

	Published Conference and Professional Magazine Papers	Short Title (paper)
17	"In Pursuit of the feel equal factor?" People Management vol.2 No. 12, June 1996 36-7	Mentor 3
18	"IT Staff Training in the UK" in Contributed Papers: Improving University Teaching , 22 International Conference, July 1997, 455-66	IT staff training
19	"The Future of Quality Enhancement" Educational Developments Vol.4 No. 3, 10-12 2003	Future of QE

Notes

1. **Towards Strategic Staff Development**, OUP/SRHE, Buckingham 2003 is foreshortened to 'Towards Strategic SD'
2. Short titles have been used in the text to overcome the problem of long and confusing references that arise from the number of papers and co-authors. Each time a short title is used it is italicised for clarity and the full title is given the first time a paper that makes a major contribution to a chapter is mentioned. Otherwise normal referencing conventions are used.
3. Full details of co-authors and proportional contributions to each paper are given in appendix 1, along with details of some minor publications that have not been included in the submission.
4. Table 2 at the end of the introduction shows how each paper contributes to the themes of the chapters that follow.

Chapter 1: Introduction

This introduction aims to outline underlying research questions, define key concepts, and set the work within the context of HE research and my career progress. In brief, my work seeks to address the contribution of SD to enhancement of quality in HE. I have sought to explore a cluster of research questions in this area, the focus varying slightly over time as my roles have changed and developed, opening and closing opportunities for investigative work. The primary research questions have been: how may SD contribute to enhancing HE and what are the implications of those contributions for HE staff, HEIs, and the SD community itself? How are HE organisations and management changing and how may staff and SD professionals engage with and influence such changes? At the next level down, I have developed associated, more particular questions, for specific projects. Examples include: What are the prospects for successful re-alignment of enhancement bodies, including the main one for SD? What strategies have been developed to enhance the contribution of PTT? Are they well founded and influential? How far do they meet the needs of stakeholders, including PTT themselves? The title is designed to reflect this cluster of questions.

First, I turn to my developing understanding of SD, indicating how my papers have emerged from this journey. Then I outline the concept of enhancement and how this body of work relates to it, before seeking to place my work within the context of HE research more generally. A brief final section shows how my career has developed, involving shifts of field of study and transitions into new roles and how that has impacted on the opportunities for research.

Staff Development (SD)

In my usage, SD is an inclusive term that refers to all staff and a broad range of activities. A starting point for defining SD is Webb (1996). He defines SD as "... the institutional policies, programmes and procedures which facilitate and support staff so that they may fully serve their own and their institution's needs." (1996: 1). The definition is useful, both in its inclusiveness and in its reference to the tensions between individual and institutional needs, but subject and department dimensions need to be added (*Towards Strategic Staff Development in Higher Education 2003: xiii*). SD also potentially embodies the notion of an intermediary seeking to satisfy bottom up, top down, middle in and middle out impulses, implying multiple roles (honest broker, critical friend, facilitator, advocate, trainer etc) and an ability to operate at multiple levels, with multiple partners.

My early papers concerned initial training programmes, related initiatives (on mentoring), and practical forms of development embedded within academic cultures (e.g. POT). The contribution to enhancement is thus primarily through individual change, albeit in a peer environment, stimulated by the mechanisms of reflective practice and professional conversations. These papers are grouped together in the chapter 'going with the grain'. Over time I became interested in examining and effecting broader and deeper enhancement. This implied focusing on collective and strategic forms of SD at department, subject community and particularly organisational level, and a SD function willing and able to engage with senior management agendas and local communities of practice and doing it with integrity.

This work features strongly in my chapters in *Towards Strategic SD* and in the chapter 'Changing HE, Transforming SD'. The main concern of the 'Managerialism and Professionalism' chapter, however, is professionalisation as an enhancement strategy for the academic profession, faced by managerialism, and for the SD community itself increasingly challenged by questions of capacity and capability. So this body of work suggests that SD has a potentially large role to play in enhancing HE, including at levels requiring fundamental change but raises a gentle question about the ability of the SD community to fulfil the necessary roles.

In the studies represented by these chapters, I bring together a wide range of research on different aspects of HE that was previously separate, including work on individual reflective practice, communities of practice, academic identity, change management and organisational learning to develop a multi-faceted notion of SD well beyond its origins in inducting academic staff into teaching roles (Mattheson 1980) supplemented by voluntary participation training events. This broadening and deepening of the notion of SD and its potential significance deliberately suggests that traditional boundaries need to be dissolved or become more porous and the need for collaborative working with a range of partners across occupational and other boundaries. I recognise that this inclusive and ecological approach does however raise its own problematic boundary issues, notably the question what are the boundaries conceptual and practical to SD? I shall return to this point in the conclusion.

During my research journey, I develop a particular notion of strategic SD, focussed on contributions to organisational learning at 'top' and 'middle' levels particularly but emphasize the need to retain critical stances within SD functions and provision oriented to the needs (and even wants) of individuals. It is a view of 'strategic' that includes contributions to organisational coherence and policy formation but not at the expense of the needs of staff, which I express in terms of the need to respond to, integrate (where possible) and satisfy impulses from different parts of the organisation, recognising that these will not always be aligned easily or at all.

Quality Enhancement (QE) in HE

Middlehurst (1997) defines quality enhancement in terms of levels:

- Making explicit aims, objectives and outcomes.
- At the next level, incremental change while maintaining the current direction
- At the third level seeing things in new ways, which may involve transformational change (quoted in *Promoting QE*)

Jackson (2002: 2-3) argues that this might be manifested in terms of:

1. Abandoning something that is not working
2. Doing existing things better / more efficiently
3. Making better use of something
4. Expanding something that is considered to be desirable
5. Adding new things to existing things
6. Connecting things to make different things
7. Doing entirely new things which replace or complement existing things
8. An improved capacity to do something in the future

Jackson argues that capturing the tacit learning that comes about in the process of changing is a key aspect of enhancement as it is integral to dissemination and spreading enhanced practice. A recurring focus for me has been enhancement of teaching and learning through SD, whether through initial training (*Opportunity Knocks*), POT (*POT paper*), development of PTT (*TC paper*), subject based SD (*subject dimension paper*) or national, strategic engagement in the development of the QE agenda and its organizations (*Promoting QE* and *Future of QE* papers). This reflects longstanding personal commitment, my career path and the sometimes unpredictable opportunities that have arisen to engage with the relevant terrain and its scholarship. Latterly I have become focused on organizational change *per se* at subject, departmental and institutional levels and the kind of capacity development that might be required within the SD community to engage at these levels. As a result my engagement with peer cultures has deepened to a concern with discipline communities, learning in such communities, organizational learning and how it may be effected at a strategic level. Over my career my work has covered all of these levels and manifestations of enhancement, moving over time to more strategic, larger scale change connected with stimulating 'new things' and capacity building for future utilization. This tendency is reflected in the thematic organisation of the submission but it is a tendency rather than a rule since fixing things that are not working but are nonetheless worthwhile recurs in my work from time to time.

HE Research

How does this work relate to the broader corpus of HE research? In part two of Tight's recent comprehensive review (Tight 2003), he seeks to categorise the main themes in HE research. My 19 papers cover a range of these themes, with research on academic work the core focus, closely followed by and related to Tight's 'quality' category. Other areas are touched upon as a result of pursuing these concerns and only the student experience category is left unexplored. To help guide the reader through what follows, I review my work against Tight's categorisation (Tight 2003: 57-180).

1. Researching Teaching and Learning. Concern to improve teaching and learning pervades my early work on initial training, POT and my later work at LTSN but a direct focus on pedagogy does not feature strongly.
2. Researching Course Design. Two papers focus primarily on this category, on work based assessment and establishing a new course in Bulgaria, however otherwise this element does not feature strongly.
3. Researching the student experience. No papers directly address this.
4. Researching Quality. Quality enhancement is the major focus and interest that often sits alongside concern with work in HE, for example in early papers on POT and mentoring. In line with my career development, two later papers focus on promoting quality enhancement at national level.
5. Researching System Policy. My main contributions are in relation to SD strategy, managerialism, and advocacy of professionalizing SD.
6. Researching Institutional Management. The *PTT paper* focuses on institutional strategy, as do papers on '*Rethinking SD*, *Departmental SD*, and '*Changing HE*'.
7. Researching Academic Work. This is the main focus of my work and a key linking theme. Even papers with major themes elsewhere have this as a minor theme. Major examples are the papers on *POT*, *mentoring* (1, 2, 3), *TC*, *PTT*, *the subject dimension* of SD and *academic roles*.

Researching Knowledge. The work on *subject dimension* of SD draws heavily on the work of Becher and Henkel to examine appropriate forms of development although knowledge is not itself a direct focus.

Arranging the work around Tight's categorisation of HE themes would not however produce a balanced or coherent text. My three central chapters are therefore more reflective of the organic development of my work and interests. 'Going with the Grain', has a strong theme around peer cultures, which fits best with Tight's academic work category (7) although his teaching and learning (1) and, to a lesser extent course design (2) categories, are minor themes of significance. System level policy (5) and institutional management (6) form the basis for one chapter on 'Managerialism and Professionalism'. "Changing HE, Transforming SD", addresses issues in the categories academic work (7), institutional management (6) and system level policy (5) in that order. In the table at the end of this introduction I set out how the papers submitted relate to the three substantive chapters.

My Career and its relationship to the submission.

After completing an undergraduate degree in Politics, I undertook an MA in Industrial Relations. Following this MA, I was a fixed-term contract researcher on two ESRC funded projects on trade union democracy and civil service staff relations (1980-84).

A logical move was to become Lecturer, then Senior Lecturer in HRM and Industrial Relations, at the **Coventry Business School** (1985-90). In this role I became involved in SD to improve my teaching. With the exception of one cross over publication on new managerialism, no papers from this era are included in this submission, although I have continued to use the insights from this field of study.

For career development reasons, I moved to a SD post at the **University of Nottingham** (1991-2000), ending as Director of SD. From the outset the role combined initial training of new lecturers and management development for deans and HoDs and I developed it towards an OD focus.

In 2000 I moved to the **Learning and Teaching Support Network**, which, while narrowing the content of my engagement to predominantly learning and teaching, involved national engagement with enhancement agendas beyond SD. It also provided a deeper engagement with the ideas surrounding learning and change in subject communities.

Higher Education Funding Council of England, South East Regional Consultant (since 2003). This role places emphasis on relationship management, acting as an honest broker between the Council and regional HEIs; pro-active pursuit of projects that converge the agendas of HEIs, the Council, and regional stakeholders; and crisis management. It also provides policy engagement with 'third stream' funding. This has taken me beyond my previous SD role and, in the longer run, potentially extends my interest in and investigation of enhancing HE..

In summary, I have made a number of transitions in my career- from researcher to lecturer, from lecturer to SD professional, from institutional SD practitioner to wider intermediary and enhancement roles at regional and national levels. These changes of role and level have also been accompanied by changes of field of operation and study:

from Industrial Relations to HR academic, from HR academic to HE SD practitioner, and latterly change oriented intermediary roles at national and regional levels. In making these shifts, I have worked closely with networks, partners and collaborators and in part this explains why I have such a large number of joint publications. It also indicates why the foci of my work has shifted over time, reflecting differential opportunities that have arisen, or I have been able to create, in roles which have not specifically required research outputs.

Table 2: Relationship of papers to the core chapters

Short title - Refereed Papers	Going with the Grain	Managerialism and Professionalism	Changing HE, Transforming SD
POT	3	1	1
Mentor 2	3		
Opportunity Knocks?	2	2	2
Teaching Circles	3		
Changing HE	1	1	3
Bulgarian paper	3		1
Promoting QE			3
PTT		3	1
Strategic Leadership		2	3
Chapters			
NM (New Managerialism)		3	1
Work Based Assessment	3		
Mentor 1	3		
Rethinking SD	2	2	3
Developing Departments	3		2
Academic Roles		3	1
Subject Dimension	3		2
Other pubs			
Mentor 3	3		
IT staff training			3
Future of QE			3

KEY

3 themes of paper are central to chapter

2 themes of paper are very relevant to chapter and discussed in it

1 themes of paper or substantial points in it have some relevance and are mentioned

Note: The introduction, methodology chapter and conclusion relate to all papers and are therefore not included in the table.

Chapter 2: Going with the Grain

Introduction

A major focus of my writing has been the potential of peer processes and peer group learning as enhancement strategies culminating in four publications in 1996 on two peer mechanisms, POT and mentoring. Towards the end of the 1990s an FDTL project provided an opportunity to investigate a third mechanism, teaching circles. I returned to the subject of POT when I led a major national project at LTSN from 2000.

In the early articles on mentoring and POT I argued (with Monica McLean) for a peer focus on largely pragmatic grounds of 'fit' with academic culture and organization (*Peer Observation of Teaching and Staff Development*) and as an effective way of promoting reflective practice, in particular in aligning 'theories in use' and 'espoused theories' (*Opportunity Knocks? Professionalism and excellence in university teaching*). Later papers went further, investigating why peer mechanisms appear to work in some contexts but not others developing a notion of ownership of change after Kelly (1998) (*Teaching Circles: a way forward for part time teachers*). In my work on subject based SD my thinking developed further and drawing on the work of Becher (Becher 1989; Becher and Trowler 2001) on academic tribes and territories and Henkel (2000) on academic identity, suggested that peer learning is intimately tied up with and embedded in discipline identity and loyalty. This leads to discussion of the potential tensions between and convergence of the vertical subject based enhancement route and the horizontal interests of institutions in having institutionally consistent approaches, for example to curriculum matters (*Developing the Subject Dimension to Staff Development*). In the chapter on departments I utilize the notion of communities of practice as the appropriate contextualization of peer learning and, returning to the issue of ownership, note the literature on the transfer problem, both social and cognitive, which suggests that locating SD within normal working lives of the community assumes primary importance (*Developing Departments*). This marks an implicit shift from a focus on 'reflective practice' conceived of rather narrowly to one on socially located practice as central to learning (see Trowler and Knight 2002), a broader notion encompassing both reflection and action.

The first section focuses on the peer processes I studied, the material I gathered and the arguments I developed about implementation and impact. The next section focuses more particularly on the role of peer groups in stimulating change in HE. The third section turns to more recent work on the conceptualization of 'peer' in communities of practice and on strategic change, illustrating some of the challenges and opportunities that this reformulated focus suggests. A separate concluding section provides an assessment of the contribution of the work.

Initial training and teaching and learning

On appointment my SD role involved initial training of new lecturers as one of two major priorities. *Opportunity Knocks* and a conference paper (McLean and Blackwell

1995) grew from this work directly and the work on POT and mentoring indirectly. A major focus was promoting 'reflective practice', which is explained in some depth in the papers featured in this section but receives its most developed treatment in *Opportunity Knocks*.

Peer Processes

In the *POT* paper I argue that SD functions that successfully promote POT may address two main problems: the issue of 'ownership' by academic staff on the one hand, and on the other strategic engagement especially for those located in personnel offices. The rationale for POT rests on reflective practice and aligning "theories in use" and "espoused theories". A learning cycle is posited following Schon and Kolb on the one hand, and on the other extending the sense of enquiry and curiosity associated with research into teaching. The paper assesses the POT process against Gibbs four 'underpinning principles' namely 'going with the culture and values and not against them'; 'building on existing organizational patterns and not cutting across them'; 'building on skills that are well developed'; and negotiating and publishing explicit statements of mission and reward that are coherent and mutually supporting.

To achieve organizational change the paper argues that POT needs to be located within a supportive context and both respect and challenge existing boundaries. The paper concludes that ... "POT has sought to build on existing cultures, structures and skills, but to achieve change the culture needs to be pushed; existing organizational patterns made more porous and flexible and existing skills extended into new and for some staff challenging contexts. Starting with existing culture, structures and skills is essential but so is moving on" (*POT*: 167).

The overall pragmatic orientation, learning occurring through individual reflection on peer interaction, is evident in three further articles on mentoring (two with Monica McLean). In *Mentor 1 (Formal Pupil or Informal Peer?)* the emerging interest in mentorships as a form of development in HE is noted and the paper seeks to challenge the orthodox preference for formal, hierarchical schemes of written rules, training, active selection and monitoring. It argues for the benefits of informality and peer based schemes, in which learning is collaborative and two way (rather than hierarchical and one way). It presents a four fold classification of mentoring schemes along two axes, anchored at either end by pupil and peer on the horizontal plane and formal and informal on the vertical plane. It focuses mainly on the role of mentees and draws most of its evidence from their feedback in two HEIs

The case for informality rests largely on the preferences revealed by those engaged in mentorships on the one hand and on the other evidence of the existence of considerable informal mentorship which work well and may be damaged by the imposition of formal schemes. The paper recognizes the case for remedial action where mentorships are ineffective but argues that other options exist, such as handling the matter informally through the departments concerned. It also identifies the need to build in feedback loops to enable this to happen and to counter the lack of evaluative evidence.

The case for a peer focus is made largely in terms of its fit with academic culture and values. There is a discussion of variation in departmental sub cultures based on faculty or discipline grouping and examples are presented from the University of Nottingham. The notion of peer is taken from the Oxford Dictionary and is discussed in relation to status, age and assumptions about knowledge. A brief paragraph about knowledge highlights collaborative two way learning. It argues for a collaborative view of learning which treats it as “a social, non-competitive autonomous process that generates its own source of authority for knowledge (i.e. it is not given by the instructor/teacher). In this view, learning may involve assimilation into communities of knowledgeable peers as much as learning about “things” (*mentor 1*: 28).

The paper concludes “it seems both desirable and pragmatically sensible to go with the culture and values, wherever that is possible, rather than to cut across them... Although the research and evaluation base for prescriptive statements [about mentoring] appears to be weak, it is probably necessary to combine formal and informal features, laying down a minimal framework of flexible rules. For staff developers, a practical desire to get things moving must be tempered by a little caution. While the apparently time efficient and cost effective nature of mentoring are attractive selling points, these advantages can be lost if inappropriate models are pushed through in over formal schemes. Apparently valued relationships and arrangements often exist locally and can easily be damaged in the desire to provide an inclusive, quality assured system. The challenge is to encourage such informal relationships while at the same time providing a formal safety net for those unable to develop them” (*Mentor 1*: 30-31).

Mentor 2 (Mentoring New University Teachers) develops these arguments further. It focuses primarily on the role of the mentor rather than that of the mentee (as discussed in *Mentor 1*) and the notion of peer learning rather than informality. It argues for mutuality, egalitarianism and collaborative learning as underpinning the peer based role while restating the case for informality. It claims that many of the roles commonly ascribed to the mentor alone may be equally applied and performed by mentees (page 82). Greater use is made of evidence on extensiveness and, a wider literature accessed, notably Megginson and Clutterbuck (1995) and an HEQC overview report (HEQC 1992). The phases of mentoring are considered more fully, as are the questions that come up in discussions between mentor partners.

Two new strands to the argument are concerned with the case for formal intervention where inappropriate attitudes and behaviours are being modeled, perhaps when a conservative department or cynical individual is transmitting their world view to the mentee. It expresses scepticism that formal training can counteract such tendencies and sees a case for formal intervention only in the grossest cases of failure, dissatisfaction or manipulation. Much is seen to depend operationally on the head of department and the department’s SD representative and it is suggested that on the whole it is at this level that evidence of apparent failure needs to be addressed. The paper argues, however, that such worries must not be a cloak for tackling particularly

unfavoured sub cultures. Indeed, it is argued that sub-cultural diversity is a strength of universities and that 'counter cultures' may be valuable in promoting organizational learning (*Mentor 2*: 83). A second area that is picked up more strongly is the whole question of assessing effectiveness. It suggests that research is required into (1) whether mentored individuals move more quickly up the learning curve than unmentored ones, and if so, (2) which models appear most effective.

Mentor papers 1 and 2 were addressed to the HE SD community. *Mentor 3* took the argument into the heartland of the HR community through their professional magazine and aimed to challenge their unreflective enthusiasm for hierarchical schemes. It focused on the importance of peer interactions, two-way learning and referred to emerging evidence from the health service. In relation to formality it argued 'if it ain't broke don't fix it'.

Peer Groups and Change

During the 1990s I became aware of the AAHE project on peer learning (Hutchings et al 1996), which included teaching circles amongst its mechanisms, as well as the fact that the history department at Nottingham, had a group that met regularly and occasionally referred to themselves as a 'teaching circle'. My involvement with part time teacher development, which went back to 1990, provided an opportunity to experiment with this form of development. In the *TC paper* ('Teaching Circles: a way forward for PTTs in HE?') I explored (with Joanna Channell and John Williams) the use of teaching circles (peer discussion groups focused on teaching) as an enhancement tool and support system for PTTs in four contrasting case study schools at University of Nottingham. The paper examined in detail the ways in which the TCs were established. It included cases of apparent success and clear failure and assessed the variables involved. It argues that peer based TCs are a strategy open to Schools (or Departments) for PTTs however the chances of success are heavily context specific. Careful analysis of predisposing structural, historical and attitudinal conditions is shown to be essential, providing a basis for tailoring the TC's role and characteristics to these local conditions. As not all the TCs were successful some negative as well as positive factors were identified. Extant provision, for example mentoring and workshops may pre-dispose participants to question the value added of the TC. The TC name may be off putting to UK people ('sounds like knitting circles').

Overall, stimulating and achieving participant 'ownership' is seen as critical. Drawing on Kelly's work on mobilization (1995), central processes to ownership are identified as attribution of causation, identity and leadership (leadership in this context meaning the 'framing' of the initiative and competent organization). The concept of ownership has wider value for change programmes, it is argued, and for those uncomfortable with its apparent overtones of manipulation, provides a potential point of departure that highlights power interests.

Sensitivity to peer cultures and the need to engage with them is central to my recent work on curriculum change too. The main study approaches the themes in a radically

different context (Bulgaria) drawing on soft systems methodology partly to connect with the mindset of engineers. Although the study takes a fairly conventional approach to course design focusing mainly on structuring the knowledge base, peer group and wider institutional and structural changes (beyond the peer group) emerge as key tasks. But before going to that, my earlier piece on work based assessment (*Work Based Assessment: the Case of the Graduate Diploma in Employment Relations*) represents a more conventional going with the grain, in this case of professional accreditation and educational development prescription. This case study concerns a postgraduate course established in 1998 with professional status from the Institute of Personnel Management (IPM now the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development). The final term was given over to a project based placement which carried 40% of the overall course mark but with the emphasis on the project rather than the placement.

The paper emphasizes the desire to avoid 'unreflective description of work experience' and although this is largely judged to have been a success it did create some mismatch of expectations between organizations and students. A recommendation for dealing with this is learning contracts. Second, the 'learning log' element of self monitoring is largely judged to have been a failure. The article says that 'the whole of the assessment process cried out for greater student involvement. Both the learning log and oral presentations (given as part of the assessment) would be obvious candidates for self and peer assessment' (*Work Based Assessment*: 84) although in fact, the IPM accreditation panel commended the assessment strategy of the course.

In the *Bulgarian study (Design of an Industrial Management Course: Bringing Together Engineering and Educational Approaches)* I consider (with Svetan Ratchev, and Maurice Bonney) the establishment of an industrial management course at the Technical University of Sofia. Achievements included development of a new curriculum, modularization, introduction of a new teaching quality assurance system and accreditation by the Institution of Electrical Engineers. The role of SD in this process was in relation to influencing strategies, to win over 'the hearts and the minds' of the staff involved including senior staff, to undertake some traditional training type activities to establish processes and procedures that would embed SD and enhancement within the Bulgarian system, notably cascade seminars in Sofia and POT to contribute to course design discussions and decisions.

The process of change is shown to require great sensitivity to the context. Flexibility of approach, deployment of influencing strategies and skills designed to establish and maintain good relationships with a range of stakeholders and a fluctuating cast of characters, including ministers for HE, emerge as critical as much as expertise in curriculum development. For example, Bulgarian academic staff were at that time paid according to the hours that they taught and therefore any change that reduced hours for individuals, which often translated into modules since each module typically was owned by one person, would be fiercely contested. Our project goals implied new modules within a requirement to reduce, not increase, student hours. In

this case we made provision for a stream of 'elective' modules to ensure that all existing Bulgarian staff had potential to input under the new course and put considerable effort into dialogue-based SD, partly delivered by peers from the University of Nottingham, on the desirability and benefits of change. External influencing behaviour was essential too, including connecting with national bodies and actors in order to achieve national sanction for the new course (which required legal change to the register of approved courses).

The paper also asserts that change is facilitated by the development of a subject specific approach. It suggests that a problematic element in the curriculum change process, and in the SD relating to it, was the failure specifically to address underlying educational values, potentially raising a doubt as to whether processes designed to ensure ongoing enhancement had really become embedded. Moreover, this hints at a wider issue in adopting a predominantly pragmatic focus on peers, a lack of certainty over the conceptual grounding of SD processes and prescriptions for action. This is addressed in later work.

Communities of Practice and Strategic SD

The centrality of social learning in 'the community of practice', hinted at in previous papers is developed in my papers on departmental SD and strategic SD in my co-edited book with Paul Blackmore. In '*Developing Departments*' (in *Towards Strategic SD*) I argue that the department is the main activity system for staff (effectively the Community of Practice) and that departmental cultures have a strong influence over staff thinking such that they are more likely to respond positively to messages from within their culture than those from external courses and development. There are also doubts over the transferability of external training into internal practice, notwithstanding evidence from Rust (1998) that enthusiastic volunteers on teaching courses who say they will make changes to practice do appear to do so. The importance of tacit, informal, social learning distributed across the department is asserted and 'bricolage or tinkering' identified as a legitimate approach where a healthy community of practice already exists. This puts a special emphasis on creating opportunities for reflection and learning in normal meetings, local leaders supporting innovators and modeling 'good practice' and so on. Three roles are seen as central: the Head of Department, the local SD representative and the SD unit. A new fourfold classification of the role of the departmental SD representative is presented along 2 axes (high/low capability and reactive/proactive stances) and up to ten potential activities identified.

I consider how SD is best organized to serve and develop communities of practice and departments. Based on the work of Hicks (1999), the paper argues that the central unit may operate along two separate dimensions producing four models – along a local-central axis and a generic discipline-specific dimension. Hicks identifies central models: dispersed models, involving devolution of resources sometimes establishing a purchaser-provider relationship between departments and units; mixed models in which a number of different forms of initiative co-exist in a largely unrelated way, and finally an integrated model which takes a holistic approach. By implication he

favours an integrated approach which appears rare. The importance of project based funding in the UK is identified although my paper suggests that largely unrelated coexisting activity is more common than integration. Finally, the paper argues that in a mature learning culture the case for a central unit may be less strong although important activities remain to be fulfilled. In general, I suggest a greater focus on the strategic needs of departments, the provision of brokerage and consultancy services and an increase of capacity within SD units themselves is required.

In the *subject dimension paper (Developing the Subject Dimension to Staff Development)* I discuss (with Cliff Allan and Graham Gibbs) related issues from the perspective of the subject community and the disciplinary identity of academic staff. The paper argues that discipline or subject based projects have shown considerable potential for developing staff and overcoming discipline based hostility to generic SD but that issues of sustainability – how to ensure the continuing impact of projects after funding has ceased – and knowledge management have stimulated the development of a dedicated subject-based network in the UK (the LTSN now part of the HE Academy). Four subject based case studies are briefly outlined (chemistry, languages, geography, history) and eight common issues identified. Of particular relevance to this chapter is the notion of ‘the whole being more than the sum of the parts’. The paper argues that “SD strategies often comprise a series of separate components. Each may be, on its own, of moderate quality and limited reach, simply as a result of its modest scale and funding, and may operate largely in isolation. The Languages and History projects brought components together and also brought end users together across the components. In such circumstances an informal ‘benchmarking’ process takes place involving a levelling up of expectations of quality and also a sense that there is a larger shift taking place of which each small corner is just a part” (p70). This begins to specify how a healthy community of practice may be built. The paper takes this further, however, both recognizing the specific challenges that different academic cultures present and offering (partial) explanation for the apparent differences in receptivity of different departments in HEIs.

“Becher's classic analysis of 'academic tribes and territories' identified four dimensions along which disciplines varied, relating to cognitive (hard v soft knowledge and the pure-applied continuum) and social factors, such as convergent communities being contrasted with divergent ones and ‘rural’ research styles being contrasted with ‘urban’ ones (Becher 1989).... The task of enhancing learning and teaching within disciplines is not the same across the academy, and the pace of change is likely to vary. Hard knowledge areas with a high level of convergence around common norms (such as mathematics and physics) seem to present the greatest challenge in a world dominated by research. The case studies here show what can be done, however, in a largely hard area of knowledge albeit with a rather fragmented community (chemistry) and in a convergent culture, albeit of soft knowledge (History). Geography, a discipline renowned for its openness, presents a case of a multi-disciplinary (divergent) area that might be thought more receptive to external 'soft' knowledge” (*Subject Dimension*: 74). As well as the explicit message

about working within and with varying subject cultures there is also a strong sense of the challenges that would be involved in working across such communities.

In the *Rethinking SD* I develop further my thinking (with Paul Blackmore) on engaging with departments and communities of practice. I focus on the need for staff developers to engage with organizational needs at institutional and other levels, including departmental level, without slipping into compliant managerialism and sacrificing the potential role in encouraging 'double loop' (challenging existing assumptions) and 'triple loop' learning (challenging principles of the organization).

One problem I highlight is the rather rosy view of 'communities of practice' that it may imply. Informal learning may be doing no more than reinforcing taken for granted assumptions (single loop learning) or perpetuating historical inequalities and prejudices (Billett 2002) which are difficult for the outsider to detect. A second concern is the implied exclusivity of the 'community', limited as it frequently is to full time tenured academic staff only. This implies the additional roles of promoting the necessary challenge and intervention to enable 'double loop learning' and to avoid continuation of any historical prejudices. And, encouraging inclusivity, especially whenever working with new teams or departments in formation.

At the HEI level there is however a potentially wider role in working horizontally across communities within HEIs to make connections and spread ideas and practices and to broker exchanges designed to ensure 'double loop' learning. "There may also be a role in developing tools and guidance to avoid constant local 'reinventing of wheels' and ease the path of innovation. In short a strategic co-ordination and resource provision role is implied" (*Rethinking*: 8-10).

Conclusion

In relation to this body of work I therefore make the following claims.

1. I claim to have identified early on the importance of peer based mechanisms that fit with academic culture. It is difficult in 2006 to remember that POT was in the first half of the 1990s a relative novelty (there is now of course a huge literature mainly of the 'how to do it' variety). In fact I was appointed partly to run a major project on POT at the LTSN. THES published a full page feature on this project (Blackwell 2002) and a follow up letter from me (on 29 March 2002) in response to Professor's Lapping's unfortunate experiences of POT at Poppleton (Laurie Taylor 22 March 2002). This project also produced many resources and 17 items are currently in HE Academy resource bank ([www.heacademy.ac.uk>resources>academyresources>resourcesdatabase>peerobservation of teaching](http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/resources/academyresources/resourcesdatabase/peerobservationofteaching) last accessed 23 July 2006), and an oversubscribed UK wide conference in 2003. Dissemination of the mentorship papers has been less obvious although significant. Material was shared around the East Midlands/M1/M69 (which I chaired for 5 years from 1995) and was adopted, by for example, the University of Birmingham. The LTSN conference on initial professional development (in Birmingham in 2001 approximately 100 participants) featured a session on mentoring in which these papers were

- highlighted and they were referred to in the subsequent mentoring guide for new staff. Although I have not kept records, *Mentor 3 (In Pursuit of the Feel Equal Factor)* engendered the most immediate and largest volume of direct feedback of anything I have written, including a number of phone calls and emails. It is difficult to assess the significance of this, although a debate with one person subsequently led to her referencing my work (Bennetts 2001, 2003).
2. I claim to have moved the debate on from a pragmatic focus on what fits or works in academic cultures towards an exploration of how staff come to feel ownership of enhancement activity. As these terms imply, I begin by considering how staff 'come to feel ownership' of initiatives originating from elsewhere but increasingly move from this assumption. I conclude that development needs to be embedded in every day practice in predominantly locally based communities of practice, with the specialist SD function acting as consultant, network facilitator across communities of practice but intervening more actively only where dysfunctional prejudice or similar is evident. This development of my thinking has also involved a paradigm shift, away from the largely individualist focus on reflective practice, important as that is, towards an emphasis on knowledge and learning being socially embedded, created and transmitted, locating reflection within practice. In such an approach, the question of ownership starts to dissolve, to be replaced by concern with how SD functions relate to communities and (less well developed in my work) why some communities of practice are, and others are not, able selectively to develop, process and engage with changes in their daily practice.
 3. I claim widespread dissemination of the importance of discipline identity and social organization to SD and the broader notion of social learning located in communities of practice through the publication of my co-edited book containing three chapters on these themes, two co-authored and one solely authored by me.

Chapter 3: Managerialism and Professionalism

Introduction

This chapter reflects in part my disciplinary roots in industrial relations and HRM. This enables me to bring into my analysis of HE, paradigms, frameworks and ideas about work organization and people development which do not generally inform HE research and publication. These vary from obvious applications, such as the analysis of HR strategy in relation to PTT, or knowledge of the problematic nature of 'off the job learning', through to the wider perspectives that a discipline background brings, for example the ability to look beyond the HE context when discussing management and managerialism. In particular, I consider a number of different ways in which I have investigated the phenomena of managerialism and responses to it, its impact on and interaction with SD through the HR function. The potential for development of professionalizing responses, both by the academic community and by leaders of the SD community, forms a second strand running from early publications to my most recent publication (*Strategic Leadership in Academic Development* with Paul Blackmore). In my work on the engagement of the SD community with organizational strategy and organizational leaders, I argue that managerialism is more complex and ambiguous than is often realized, and that there are ways of engaging which do not imply complete subservience. There is nonetheless a clear implication, which I have explicitly drawn out, that those SD practitioners wishing to play strategic roles within their organization will need to engage directly with institutional policy imperatives. Also, they must demonstrate their capability to develop and implement lower order tasks before they are likely to be given a role in strategy formation. This requires a contingent and context bound ethical framework in order to achieve influence and change.

I recognize that neither of the terms in the chapter title are neutral in HE discourse. 'Managerialism' usually refers to the rise of the audit culture, tighter budget controls, and associated performance indicators and performance management. It is often implicitly contrasted negatively with traditions of collegiality thought to have been dominant in the past (Clegg and McAuley 2005). Deem has developed a specific notion of 'new managerialism' (henceforth NM) in HE, consisting of three elements; particular narratives of strategic change; distinctive organizational forms and practical control technologies (Deem 2003). Professionalism tends to get a more nuanced response with the idea of 'behaving professionally', professionalism as a discourse (Aldridge and Evetts (2003), largely accepted as desirable in HE. The implication of compliance with the formal requirements of professional associations (Millerson 1964), however, applied to the academic role, tends to get a negative response, notwithstanding the fact that many academics are members of external professional associations. A claim to professional status could be seen as a claim to priority in allocation of resources and standing within HE too, which is controversial in its own right.

Managerialism and Human Resource Management (HRM)

I studied managerialism on a large ESRC funded study of the civil service (Lloyd and Blackwell 1985, *New Managerialism in the Civil Service*). This section focuses on the second paper which developed a notion of NM and coined that term. In NM I argue (with Paul Lloyd) that "the Thatcher years do mark a significant turning point denoted by the emergence of NM; a coherent strategy for management which is intended to

integrate and institutionalize key policy initiatives and operational priorities” (p 69). The main conceptual framework draws on the work of Ferner who postulates a continuum of state influence (the political contingency) “at one extreme the state merely provides the rules within which private enterprise operates. At the other, the goals, objectives and rules of operation of some enterprises may be almost entirely determined by the state” (Ferner 1985: 48 quoted on p104). It is argued that the Civil Service falls at this latter end of the continuum and that changes in the historical context, in particular the breakdown of the post war political consensus and economic crisis in the 1970s, stimulated much greater political intervention in the running of the civil service by Governments, initially driven by the necessities of maintaining incomes policies and achieving reductions in public expenditure and staff numbers. Although there are arguments for seeing the civil service as a special case, under the most direct Government control, a range of policies, initially introduced in a rather piecemeal way in the 1980s, produced a NM which eventually became applied and developed though out the public services in the form of the ‘new public management’.

NM in the CS is seen as a strategy that “involves a simultaneous centralisation of certain types of decisions and a decentralisation of operational decisions to line managers. Thus ministerial control over key processes of policy making and strategic departmental management has been tightened, while at the same time line manager discretion to manage resources has been increased although often within stringent budgetary constraints. Management information systems and central monitoring devices have been developed apace, ministerial accountability has been stressed and a range of measures taken which are designed to encourage and reward the resource efficient manager. This approach, which has similarities with that found in modern corporations (Purcell 1983; Kinnie 1985), is an attempt to create “a New Managerialism” in the civil service: that is a management able to deploy optimally declining resource inputs within constraints acting as proxies for market forces” (NM: 75).

The coming together of piecemeal initiatives, particularly the financial management initiative, a review of personnel work, and greater flexibility of pay bargaining is typical of change programmes, as I discuss in *Changing HE*. A summary and conclusion outlines Ferner’s notion of the political contingency and the importance of historical context in understanding it. The conclusion notes that “normative consensus between the principle negotiators has diminished and ideological conflict becomes more common at all levels. Thus, in contrast to the past high levels of trust and strong bargaining relationships have become difficult to establish and maintain” (page 107). In general the trends, it is argued, are sufficiently well established that they are likely to continue (page 108) although industrial relations stability (one focus of the paper) is questionable. It may be that the 2006 pay dispute and its contested settlement raise a similar question in HE too.

Deem (Deem 1998, 2003, Deem and Johnson 2000) has been one of the main proponents of NM in HE although others have contributed (e.g. Trowler 1998). Deem’s work in fact rests heavily on Ferlie et al (1996). She notes that they develop four models of NM which ‘to some extent’ represent historical stages. One of these models or stages (which she dubs ‘the efficiency model’) corresponds with the model I identified in the civil service and indeed, according to Deem, is the one which fits best with HE (Deem 2003). Based on this work I would question the claim that NM

in HE is in fact 'new'. I shall return to this observation and develop its implications in the conclusion. For the moment, suffice it to say that NM is not uncontested. There has been one direct response from a senior manager (Watson 2000) to the early work on NM. Watson responds in part that NM rests on a myth about the past when universities are assumed to have operated effectively based on consensus and collegiality. The greater accountability of managers in the modern world can be seen as an advance, he argues (Watson 2000: 6-8). Clegg and McAuley similarly challenge what they see as a 'simple managerialism/collegiate duality' underlying NM and instead focus on the 'multiple discourses' (four main ones are identified) surrounding the 'multifaceted phenomenon' of middle management in HE (Clegg and McAuley 2005). Some senior managers have articulated alternative views of their role too. Cuthbert (2002), for example, argues that universities are best seen as 'organized anarchies'. He brings together the 'garbage can theory of organizational choice' and Barnett's work on super complexity (Barnett 2002), in which the institution is characterized as a 'moving mosaic', to argue that the role of managers is 'properly limited'. Nonetheless the notion that managerialism, in a general sense, is an issue in HE is well established (see *Academic Roles*).

I have sought to engage with this phenomenon in two related ways. I have examined HR strategy in the context of the growing engagement of PTTs across the sector. Part of the hostility to links with HR in the SD community arises from the perceived role of HR in managerialism (especially in performance management) and this strand seeks to address that issue. Second, I have examined the relationship between the HR community and staff developers and, related to this, the question of the structural alignment of HR and SD. The growth in scope and size of the HRM function, which has arisen from a variety of sources (see *PTT paper*), poses a particular challenge for SD. Commonly perceived as making a claim to incorporate SD, various arguments and practical tactics have been developed by the SD community to avoid close association with it. While always enunciating a strong case for a separate SD function, I have sought to argue for HRM to be a 'loosely coupled' partner in some tasks (e.g. pursuit of proper rewards for excellence in teaching to match those available in research).

HR function in HE.

In the *PTT study (Managing temporary workers in higher education: still at the margin?* with Colin Bryson), I investigated five case study institutions selected to provide representative samples of both institution type and heavy users of PTTs. They displayed contrasting strategic approaches, on a continuum of integration into the main workforce on the one hand, and on the other, deepened differentiation. Integration involves a full task range and the same employment package as full time staff *pro-rata*. Differentiation involves clearly dividing part-time staff from full-time staff, by for example restricting their task range, removing those activities most likely to lead to complaint or worries about quality (e.g. marking) and a more limited employment package. Both approaches were found to be problematic in practice, in the sense that there was some ambiguities and compromises made largely to reflect the needs of heads of department for great functional flexibility (where differentiation strategies were preferred), and, to respond to the desire of some PTTs (notably professionals in disciplines like art and design) for a transactional relationship where integrationist approaches were officially preferred. The paper expresses scepticism about whether some of the benefits of the differentiation strategy will be realized. For

example, it questions whether there really is a reduced cost once indirect transactional costs are included. Integrationist approaches, in one case championed by the head of HR, seem to hold out better prospects for organizational gain and staff satisfaction despite the ambiguities and compromises in practice. The paper notes the enhancement of SD provision for the PTT and the implication that this will have to be further developed where integration strategies are adopted. In this context, managerialism may be affecting PTTs but if so it is somewhat ambiguous in its effects. In its integrationist guise, pursued by some HR functions and top management teams, it may well constitute an advance on what hitherto existed.

This paper therefore underscores the need to address the whole of the employment package, including the psychological contract, in order to achieve real change. By implication it also points to the weakness of the HR function in HE, constrained by the needs and desires of heads, and the heterogeneity of the labour force. There was a strong sense, reported in the article, that where PTT strategy clashed with higher order academic strategy objectives (as it clearly did in one case) as perceived by the head or dean, such as ensuring the best possible outcome from the RAE, it was the PTTs policy that would suffer. There remained a distinct sense that HR was a second order activity, playing a key strategic role only where the issue concerned was not of the highest priority or was derivative of first order strategies determined in the top management group (e.g. derived from RAE strategy, such as designing and implementing arrangements to retain high performers in research subject to poaching from elsewhere).

Relationship between HR and SD

In a number of publications over nearly a ten year period I have argued (with colleagues) for the need for the academic profession to take responsibility for its own professionalisation, notably in *Opportunity knocks* and *academic roles papers*, an argument extended to leaders of SD recently (in *Strategic leadership*). Initial emphasis was on the teaching function and the potential of professionalisation as an enhancement strategy. In *Opportunity Knocks* the teaching quality assessment process is however seen to have created a major opportunity albeit one based on a managerial discourse inimical to academic values. The notion is that staff need to take control of the agenda and define their own professionalism, including standards and development requirements. Subsequently, in *academic roles* this argument is set in a slightly different context of the changing role of academic staff and broadened to encompass the whole of the academic role.

In an early article on *POT*, I addressed the claim that SD functions linked with personnel departments could not engage with academic cultures and did not in practice pursue focused strategic SD. I identified four key conditions facilitating strategic engagement in such circumstances: changes in the personnel function, adoption of a partnership model of operation by the SD function, the ability of the staff developers to gain trust and respect, and visible and sustained support from the academic leadership (167-9). I further developed this argument in *Rethinking* pointing to "a range of practical reasons for working together. At one time it may have been possible for academic staff developers, catering only for tenured academic staff, to dismiss employment relationships as of little concern but not today. There are a growing number of ways in which progress in SD requires parallel and simultaneous facilitative action in employment relations. The growth of contract staff

and a large peripheral 'casualised' teaching work force employed on a hire and fire basis, makes it difficult to undertake development activities without bumping into contractual matters (e.g. career prospects in HE and payment for attending events). Pressing the case for rewarding excellent teachers (Elton and Partington 1993, Gibbs 2002) in the UK or for equal recognition for the scholarship of teaching and learning with research in USA must entail review of reward structures (D'Andea and Gosling 2001:74) and the forming of implicit or explicit alliances, including with HRM. A greater desire for team working across staff groups, and the enhanced emphasis on the role of heads of department, inevitably raises employment and reward issues as well as SD needs. This is not to say that SD function should be subsumed by HRM, but rather that the function is an increasingly important 'loosely coupled' internal partner (*Rethinking*: 6).

In *Rethinking* I also developed the argument about structural relationships, drawing on recent survey evidence. "...changes in organisational strategy may be imperfectly reflected in structural arrangements. Separate functions focussed on learning and teaching and academic staff interests appear common in the USA, Australia and parts of the UK. A recent survey of 'educational development' units in the UK (Gosling 2001) indicates a growth number in the late 1990s; Although the definition of educational development used was somewhat restrictive the data on institutional location and reporting lines is instructive. 38% were stand alone central units, and the remainder fall into 8 categories, only two of which manage double figures (HRM 17% and education departments at 13%). However, reporting lines show much more consistency: 51% report to a Pro-vice chancellor (mainly) or the Vice Chancellor/Principal (and a further 8% to Registrars, powerful heads of administration in pre 1992 universities) (Gosling 2001 78-83). On this basis I question the apparent fear of being tainted by association with management since these reporting relationships could be seen as ironically indicating tighter integration into top management than lines that run to HR or education departments.

I argue that "the variety of institutional structures reported by Gosling seems to reflect a complex of factors, including variation in institutional types and histories; shifting policy priorities; political power plays within institutions, for example by new pro-vice-chancellors; and growing policy emphasis on enhancing learning and teaching. Although evidence on relative effectiveness is thin, it may be that in relatively flat, loosely coupled systems this diversity makes good sense and allows for a 'good fit' with local particularities" (*Rethinking*: 10-11).

Professionalisation: responding to managerialism

I first developed the notion that professionalism could be a strategic response for academic staff to managerialism in *Opportunity Knocks* a paper also concerned with professionalism as an enhancement strategy.

The paper argues that a professionalizing approach based on critical enquiry is congruent with academic values, secondly that demographic change is producing more younger open minded staff and thirdly, that the teaching quality assessment process had created an opportunity to debate what constitutes 'good practice'¹. The paper concludes that its approach has the potential to enable expert teachers to emerge, as well as discipline experts, and thus staff to see an expanded professional role. Training is seen as the start of professionalizing teaching and creating a new

teaching culture. Self critical reflections, professional dialogue, taking the initiative and defining excellence are identified as key processes.

In *academic roles* (*Academic Roles and Relationships* with Paul Blackmore) this professionalizing strategy is explicitly seen as a response to the threat of managerialism. The main argument of the chapter is that traditional roles have been eroded and there is a need to establish an inclusive academic profession. It asserts that there is a need for an agreed definition of academic expertise that includes teaching, research, managerial and administrative roles. It believes that such professionalisation should be led by academic staff as a counter weight to managerialism and be broader than the exclusive focus on teaching evident in the Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education (now the HE Academy).

A set of prescriptions are then presented with implications for SD being drawn out for each. A case is made for categorisation as a way of providing identity and coherence providing it is on an inclusive basis that goes beyond the PhD. A broad ethical code ought to be possible to agree, noting McInnis's (1992) finding that there is a surprising level of agreement amongst Australian academics on this subject apparently confirmed by Henkel (2000) in the UK. Further it is asserted that very general statements of expertise in each part of the academic role ought to be achievable. The paper concludes that... "professionalisation of academic work offers a means of protecting much that is valuable in a HE institution and that distinguishes it from any other organization. It also offers a means of bridging the apparent divide between senior managers and the departmentally based academic heartlands, since it is a way of improving working effectiveness that has the potential to gain wide support from amongst the academic community." (*Academic Roles*: 28).

In my most recent article (*Strategic Leadership* with Paul Blackmore) this argument for professionalizing the academic role is developed and extended to leaders of SD. The paper advocates an explicit concern with the whole faculty role arguing that this is even more important with the trends towards fragmentation. It introduces the idea of variation over a career in response to the unrealistic requirement for continuous excellence on all fronts. The paper seeks to avoid the 'unbundling' of the role but recognizes that there will be an inevitable degree of specialization. It concludes 'threshold standards of competence or proficiency may need to be contemplated in each area' (*Strategic Leadership*: 376).

Turning to the SD function, the paper argues for the need for a parallel process for SD leaders, although for different reasons. The key question is 'put bluntly, how credible are heads or their staff in the formal preparation of faculty, if they themselves, have taken no part in formal learning?' (*Strategic Leadership*: 378). First the nature of the role is examined. The mediating role between different interests and the potential tension between strategic SD, focused on organizational needs, and the preferred ways of working of individuals are identified together with the inevitable questioning of credentials that accredited programmes bring. A picture of SD heads is then painted based on a sample of 18 (about a fifth in post) - the 'proficient head' focused on nine competences. A review of learning patterns and activities indicates a preference for informal social, tacit learning and relatively limited engagement with formal education, in common with two studies from Australasia.

It asks the question ‘what might a leadership role in the development of academic practice look like?’ The paper argues for the need to adopt a holistic conception of the academic role and move away from the default position in which academic development is associated ‘wholly or mainly’ with teaching and learning. It notes the variability of faculty roles, including changes over the course of careers, and argues that leaders need to be offered and take up similar combinations of experience with similar variability over a career.

The paper considers the need to engage at the organizational level going beyond single loop learning and the need to work horizontally across communities and identifies a range of strategic roles.

1. Horizon scanning is identified as a further organizational function.
2. ‘Establishing a knowledge base and a purpose for the leaders of academic development’.
3. Promoting evidence-based practice, seeing academic development as mainly focused on the uptake of applied social science approaches.
4. A move from a person centred orientation towards a systems orientation and a move towards policy and strategy and away from critique. This does not imply a compliant managerialism however, since questioning is seen as fundamental to a professional role.

The paper explicitly states that it sees the faculty role and the academic role being professionalized in parallel. It concludes that “accredited professional development is controversial, just as it is for faculty. It is likely to be increasingly required to demonstrate the connectedness we have argued for, and to maintain faculty and public confidence in quality. Developing such accredited provision is a difficult task but one which cannot now be delayed if heads wish to maintain and enhance their standing with their faculty and organizations” (*Strategic Leadership*: 385).

An issue to arise from this professionalizing strategy is the apparent contradiction between formal qualification courses that I recommend (in *Strategic Leadership*) and importance of informal learning and tacit knowledge that I have also asserted, in line with the preference of SD leaders (see *Changing HE and Strategic Leadership*). Although I have not sought directly to reconcile this preference with the need for formal credentials in my papers, there are emerging strategies for surfacing tacit knowledge and thereby making it available for (formal) assessment. In fact my early experiment with learning logs led me to conclude that such instruments needed to be assessed and supported to be effective (see chapter 2).

One strategy is to move towards outcome-based assessment, coupled with assessment instruments such as portfolios, which enable more ‘informal’ evidence of learning (notably from work) to be included. An integral part of such approaches is encouragement to reflection (based on the notion of reflective practice as discussed in chapter 2), often supported by supervisors, peers and mentors. The SEDA fellowship scheme is one example of this strategy (<http://www.seda.ac.uk/fellowship/fsedascheme.htm> last accessed 21 October 2006) and a variant of this approach could be readily incorporated into masters level programmes of the type I have advocated for leaders of SD.

Moving beyond questions of assessment and outcomes there is the processual question of how tacit knowledge is acquired and the role of informal learning. My focus on the situated, social dimensions of learning in communities of practice suggests an implicit stance about how to develop leaders of SD and change agents through apprenticeship like processes, increasingly integrating novices into the community. However, not all workplace cultures are equally effective in this regard and, as I note in *Rethinking*, may in fact be the bearer of prejudice (my notion of 'healthy and 'unhealthy' communities of practice). Swanick (2005) has shown how socio-cultural approaches may be applied effectively to postgraduate medical education, arguing that particular practices and support strategies tailored to the needs of the context may be required. Billett (2004) develops a notion of a workplace pedagogy. It includes four elements.

1. Access to workplace activities that provide progression to tasks of increasing complexity and monitoring of that progress by more experienced co-workers.
2. Indirect guidance that can be accessed as part of everyday work activities and interventions, including guidance by more experienced co-workers to assist learning, particularly learning that does not just occur through discovery.
3. How workplaces afford opportunities to participate in work activities and access guidance ('affordances').
4. How individuals elect to engage with work practices.

He argues that workplaces need to be "highly invitational" encouraging participation, engagement and learning (and comments that this is a challenge most employers have failed to embrace). He lists the following elements that need to be open and positive in orientation.

- Access to other workers
- Time to practice and learn
- Inclusion in knowledge sharing
- Discussion groups
- Access to knowledge
- Implementation of training
- Encouragement
- Attitude and skills of co-workers
- Opportunities to practice

In short, strategies for supporting informal learning, creating conducive conditions in which SD leaders and change agents may develop, can be devised and the tacit knowledge acquired in this context (and outwith it) can be surfaced and recognized within formal course assessment.

Conclusion.

In relation to this chapter I make the following claims.

1. To have contributed to a conceptual framework for NM before it emerged as a focus of investigation in HE or developed into the wider 'new public management'. My approach, based around an understanding of 'the political contingency' continuum and the impact of changing external political and economic context, raises different questions from the work of Deem, with its focus on 'newness'. Why did NM come so late to HE and what does that tell us about the current system? How is it likely to develop and with what

implications for staff and stakeholders? I shall return to these questions in the conclusion.

2. The HR function plays a key role in promoting managerialism and arguably NM agenda especially in relation to staff performance. I claim to have shown the continuing weakness of HR in terms of its ability to engage with organizational strategy where first order priorities are derived from academic strategy. My empirical research on part time teachers has suggested that the strategic role of HR is still limited to second order priorities, albeit with significant impact on strategic choice at that level.
3. HR is also a function which has traditionally been viewed with suspicion by the SD community because of its low status (Elton 1995) and its overt association with 'management' such that structural links with HR in particular have been viewed negatively. I claim to have questioned this stance and attitude and thus contributed to debate about the location of SD within organizations and the relationship between HR and SD (arguing for a loosely coupled partnership stance as employment and psychological contract issues cannot be neatly boxed off from development and enhancement).
4. The work on HR also follows through on my earlier work on the development of PTT through TCs in the *Teaching Circles* paper and the wider FDTL project from which it grew (Gibbs et al 2000). Together with Bryson and Blackwell (2002), it suggests that SD for these staff needs to be seen in the context of HEIs overall strategy towards PTT, including their strategic choices about the nature of the relationship they seek. I led a project at LTSN which included a major UK conference in October 2003 and the production of a range of resources, some of which have been widely quoted in the trade union campaign on casualisation (Bryson 2004). There are currently 9 items derived from this project on the HE academy web site (www.heacademy.org/resources/academyresources/resourcesdatabase/Parttimeteachers, last accessed 23 July 2006). Also, THES ran two features on this project, in May 2002 (Swain 2002) and February 2003 (Blackwell 2003) and published a letter from me on PTT on 13 December 2002.
5. I claim to have contributed to and promoted a debate about professionalizing both the academic role and the SD leadership role in response to NM. In the case of the former, the academic role, I have argued for the need for academic staff to take responsibility for defining their own professionalism, initially in relation to learning and teaching, and latterly more widely. In relation to the SD community, this need arises from a desire to see staff developers playing a strategic role within their organizations, as a component part of demonstrating their competence and capacity to institutional leaders, academic units and staff.

¹ Although I do not resile from the general argument in the paper, recent work suggests that the 'demographic time bomb' is less explosive than thought at this time (see for example HEFCE 2006). Moreover the associated comment about the 'open mindedness' of younger staff would be questioned by some in the light of the response of some staff to accredited training.

Chapter 4: Changing HE, Transforming SD

Introduction

This chapter concerns the engagement of the SD function and staff developers with change in HE. Engagement with change has been a constant theme running through my publications although the particular focus has varied and my thinking has developed. One source of variation has been the level of focus. At various times I have focused on individual academics, collective groups of peers, the institutional level and more recently the national level. The main concern at each level has been the enhancement of operational practice. A second focus has been strategies for change: the analysis, investigation and promotion of strategic approaches to change. Though analytically distinct from the focus on level there is a clear practical relationship between level of change pursued and the appropriateness of the strategies. Strategies investigated and promoted include reflective practice both for individual development and peer enhancement (*Opportunity Knocks, POT*) and for leaders of SD (*Strategic Leadership and Changing HE*); subject or discipline-focused strategy designed to address the 'not invented here syndrome' (*Subject Dimension* and *Changing HE* articles); and a focus on the local community of practice, in which there is a sense of addressing a common local culture (e.g. *Departmental SD*). Recent work has identified collaboration as a way of achieving national enhancement of learning and teaching in the absence of or as an alternative to market mechanisms, (in *Promoting QE*) and as a way of bringing together subject and institutional impulses (*Future of QE*; *Subject dimension*). Amongst other things, this work directs attention to the need for collaborative working by organizations with different foci and the need to converge and integrate impulses coming from different parts and levels of the HE system. A third concern has been the role of SD as a mediator of impulses from different levels and communities, and the implications for individual SD practitioner of this function.

Strategies for change at organizational and national level have been an increasing focus for my investigations. These studies broaden the analysis beyond the traditional concerns of staff developers, draw on work outwith HE and raise questions about the adequacy of SD thinking. This is the subject of the first section. A second section outlines my work on the related question of the changing roles of the staff developer, concentrating on seven role briefs. A final section summarizes the arguments and sets out the claims I make in relation to them.

Engaging with change and collaboration.

In *Changing HE (Changing Higher Education)* I consider (with David Preece) paradigms for understanding organizational change arguing that the SD community needs to take on board the shift from organizational development (OD) to contextual-processual (CP) models both as a way of conceptualizing their role and as a guide to action.

Changing HE applies the work of management educators to organizational change in HE with particular reference to the work of staff developers. The main argument is that academic developers have failed to reflect a shift from OD paradigms, associated with 'truth, trust, love and collaboration' orientation, towards CP frameworks. CP frameworks reject uni-directional and rationalist versions of change, emphasizing "continuously unfolding and sometimes dramatic change, the role of visionary

leadership, internal politicking, quests for power and the pursuit of career advantage” (p7). Quoting Pettigrew (*Changing HE: 7*) the paper contends that ‘the real problem of strategic change is anchoring new concepts of reality, new issues for attention, new ideas for debate and resolution and mobilizing concern, energy and enthusiasm often in additive and evolutionary fashion to ensure these early illegitimate thoughts gain powerful support and eventually result in contextually appropriate action’ (Pettigrew 1985: 438). This framework emphasizes simultaneous attention to contexts, both internal and external, the why of change; content (the what of change and process) the how of change.

The paper examines attempts to address the ‘not invented here syndrome’ in HE and the use of peer based processes to address issues of ownership. It argues that there is a failure to recognize explicitly the highly political nature of change in HE arising from changes in the external context, disciplinary rivalries, personal jockeying for position and entrenched collegiality in constitutions. The partnership model of SD, and the somewhat opaque discussion of ‘roles’ of staff developers (e.g. in Smith 1992) is seen as implicit recognition that there is more to the role than technical competence. A final section draws out the lessons for staff developers in terms of

- The choice of change strategy. OD approaches to change are more likely to succeed where it is non-political, “power assisted steering” more likely to be applicable where it is not, with the prospect of a combination of approaches over time to achieve long term change. Halford and Savage (1995) suggest that organizational change is often tied up with redefining the personal qualities required of organizational members too.
- The 7 sets of considerations or convictions which Buchanan and Badham (1999) say need to inform the change driver or ‘political entrepreneur’. Three conclusions are drawn
 - The need to recognize explicitly the shift from OD to CP approaches in conceptualizing change
 - The need to recognize and accept both the fault lines of HE and the need to operate politically
 - ‘A need for new or greatly extended forms of development for themselves and their potential future colleagues’ (*Changing HE: 12*).

In conclusion the paper argues that there is more to do, in particular a literature outside of HE that needs to be incorporated. Second, there is a need to move beyond the relatively small scale focus of much HE enhancement work towards ‘theoretically informed empirical studies of the impact of large scale initiatives such as the LTSN in order to advance our understanding of the relative effectiveness of different approaches to change and to inform the practice of change agents ‘on the ground’” (*Changing HE: 12*).

This analysis is extended to collaboration at national level in *Promoting QE*, in particular the emergence of the HE Academy (*Promoting Quality Enhancement in the UK. The experience of collaboration between national agencies*, with David Gosling and Vaneeta D’Andrea). This paper describes the quality enhancement scene in the UK prior to the creation of the HE Academy and asserts that the HE Academy has been set up to replace an overcrowded national system. It discusses in a little detail an example of this pre-existing collaboration, between the LTSN and the NCT. The main argument is that while governments continue to rely on competition as the main

driver of change in education, the lack of a market for enhancement products has encouraged a turn to collaboration to achieve objectives.

The paper contends that change management approaches are necessary. Policy initiatives are invariably interpreted through local contexts and given meanings in those contexts, implying that this needs to be appreciated in the change management process. The paper points to the resilience of disciplinary and departmental cultures and the need for outcomes to be defined in terms of the way they best serve both planners and those on the ground, seeing the change impulse as constructed and reconstructed incrementally by those involved (Trowler, Saunders and Knight 2003). The key importance of power relations is identified, drawing on Lewin and his field force theory. In this context the role of the funding council is seen as 'critical'. The paper goes on to specify some salient factors in achieving successful collaborative working on enhancement agenda, namely:

1. A shared vision spread throughout the organization in which 'those involved participated in its design, creation or development so that they experience ownership' (Berg and Ostergren 1997: 127).
2. Task orientation: that the achievement of the task is more important than defending the existing organizational structure.
3. Openness and sensitivity enabling easy sharing of people, tasks, resources and ideas between the organizations concerned
4. Pragmatism and flexibility willingness and ability to respond to circumstances are essential.
5. That 'the barriers to the collaboration are known, acknowledged and addressed'

It notes that the HE Academy should be in a more powerful position than the individual bodies that came together to create it but at the same time that this will encourage greater official interest in pursuit of 'top down mandates'. For the HE Academy... 'managing this potential tension between top down mandates and the need for an independent powerbase that enables faculty to articulate their agendas upwards and outwards will be a major challenge. Protecting a creative space for individuals and groups to experiment in learning and teaching will be a key task in this broader challenge if enhancement is to be sustained' (*Promoting QE*: 22).

The Future of QE paper concerns the creation of the HE Academy too but looks forward and addresses the staff and educational development communities. It argues that HE academy is a logical next step in the development of enhancement strategy and potentially marks a step change in the coherence and structural togetherness of QE. It sees the bringing together of the subject, institutional and individual strands of TQEF within the HE academy increasing the potential for synergy and serendipity through enhanced interactions between top down policy agendas, 'middle out' feedback of subjects and departments and 'bottom up' voice of staff. It locates the greatest potential for synergy at the level of the academic unit. The ability of departments to make sense of the various potential resources open to them, to engage positively with selected change initiatives, and to develop appropriate cultures able routinely to process change initiatives, is seen as crucial.

The paper recognizes that while the various cross cutting and overlapping impulses, create potential for new solutions and perspectives, they are also likely to bring some tensions (for example between subject specific skills and institutions approaches to skills). Some tolerance will be necessary. The prospects for greatest synergy and serendipity will be retarded should the 'bottom up' voice of subject-based practitioners be lost, although the individual membership base of the ILTHE and role of the subject centres within LTSN provide for some optimism. The paper concludes that 'there is potential to build a really significant UK wide enhancement community beyond anything achieved hitherto' (*The Future of QE*: 11).

The Roles of SD.

In this section I consider the roles of the individual staff developer. My early work on this flowed from a partnership model of SD designed to 'synthesize different needs involving negotiation and mediation between central, unit and staff concerns, the balance varying from context to context' (*POT*: 168). This notion based on the work of Smith (1992) and Elton (1995) explicitly recognizes the need to accommodate top down and bottom up impulses. In the *Subject Dimension* and *Developing the Department* chapters, I recognize the 'middle in and middle out' role of departments in HEIs and disciplinary communities nationally and add this dimension. Underlying the discussion is the notion of being an intermediary and therefore the desirability and necessity of adopting different roles. In later work the notion of 'top down' SD is developed more fully into the notion of a strategic leadership role and how that can be combined with more critical stances. Through out much of this there is a strong sense of the need for SD to transform itself, in order to grasp opportunities, face new challenges and enhance its own capacity. In what follows I shall not attempt a typology nor cover all the possible permutations but focus on those to which I have devoted most attention.

Trainer. In some publications I have focused on the role of the staff developer as trainer, notably in *Opportunity Knocks* where the focus is on upon the initial professional development of academic staff in their teaching and learning role. In the context of *POT*, this role is seen to be largely limited to facilitating the establishment of *POT* schemes including through preparatory and review workshops at departmental level. Even in these cases however a training role is not seen as enough: the *POT* article for example argues that *POT* itself needs to be located within a broader range of departmental SD activities (including teaching seminars, away days, study leave) as part of a departmental SD plan. Development both in this case and in the case of initial training (*Opportunity Knocks*), is seen as arising largely from the linked notions of reflective practice and professional conversations, in which the role of the staff developer is to facilitate the dialogue between peers (rather than 'training in' particular competences or skills). The papers on mentoring similarly grow from initial development activity but place the SD practitioner in facilitative, evaluative and problem solving roles rather than the traditional trainer role.

The Consultant role. From the outset of my SD practice this role was a major interest to me both because it was increasingly needed and because of the potential it held to extend the influence of the SD community. My early work tended to offer comment (see for example *POT*) but only latterly did the full opportunity become the subject for investigation. In *IT staff training*, I argue the need for SD to move away from the pattern of technology-based staff training existing hitherto (*IT staff training*

in the UK). This consisted of hands on basic skills training organized around the functionality of software, combined with 'awareness raising' for educational technology applications typically involving demonstrations by enthusiasts. This approach, I argue, may be appropriate for the minority of 'early adopters' but is not well attuned to the more sceptical majority of staff. This requires a shift towards change facilitation and consultancy designed to address 'cultural blocks' to the adoption of new technology in learning and teaching. In this paper I also illustrate 'top down and bottom up' strategy, notably the decentralized bottom up strategy for technology take up in the school of humanities at the University of Keele and the subject based strategy exemplified by the Teaching and Learning Technology Programme.

In *Rethinking SD* and especially in *Developing Departments*, I extend this analysis considerably focusing on the contribution to academic departments. I identify a number of potential roles in the context of providing support to local communities and scepticism about the impact of external training and course provision. These include; facilitator of events and projects in the context of re-structuring to achieve consensus on new missions and to build new teams; providing tools and guidance; facilitating learning across communities through knowledge networking and other horizontal activities; brokerage of resources and inputs to meet department needs; and direct intervention to help movement beyond 'single loop learning'. New elements include the explicit recognition of brokerage as a consultancy role (see Jackson 2003).

Political change agent. The political dimension of the SD role receives special treatment in *Changing HE*. In this article, I assert the inherently political nature of HE, notably its multiple and competing stakeholders; growing government interest in intervention matched by staff suspicion of national initiatives; the ambiguous role of senior managers; discipline rivalries and personal jockeying for position amongst those with leadership aspirations within institutions, and continuing professional autonomy within semi-collegiate constitutions that still protect the often critical voice of staff (despite growing managerialism). The Bulgarian paper provides a good example of an apparently narrow course design project that is practically and conceptually a political change management task (see *Bulgarian paper*). In this context, I argue that staff developers need explicitly to recognize their political role and prepare for it by developing the 7 sets of considerations or convictions identified by Buchanan and Badham (1999).

- **Reality is illusory.**
That is to say that reality is a social construction and the change driver needs to be active in constructing his or her own reality, including personal reputation and credibility.
- **Game on.**
As the turf game is ongoing and the cast of characters changing, there is a need to play continuously.
- **The credibility factor.**
The need to establish and maintain the right reputation
- **In context.**
Conventional change management methods (e.g. project management, OD etc) are still relevant but the main factor is what is contextually appropriate.
- **A situational ethic.**
Universal ethical principles are difficult to apply to political behaviour in

organisations. Decisions need to be based on 'informed judgement of what is possible, of what is acceptable, of what is justifiable and of what is defensible in the situation' (*Changing HE*: 206).

- **The reflective practitioner.**

The reflective practitioner is self conscious, self aware, self-critical and learns from experience. Self-monitoring makes the change driver flexible and alert.

- **Risky shift.**

The successful change driver needs to take risky shifts in role and career terms. The role 'can be more of a life style than a job. Without energy and commitment, stamina and good health, the change driver is likely to struggle.' (*Changing HE*: 207)

Strategic Collaborator or Partner. I have also examined the staff developer as an intra- and inter- organizational collaborator or partner. This is evident in *IT staff training*, in which I argue that the SD function will need to share the agenda with educational technologists and others. In *Rethinking SD* I emphasize the need to see the HR function as a 'loosely coupled' partner. In the *Subject Dimension* paper, I deal explicitly with the need for staff developers to extend this collaboration to extra institutional subject communities. An example of this is the tripartite model of development for PTT staff, in which institutionally based staff developers have collaborated with their internal academic departments and LTSN subject centres, in order to meet the desire of PTT staff to have 'relevant', in context SD. This presages later work on extra-institutional collaboration to achieve QE.

Action Researcher. I discuss my own role as an action researcher in the methodology chapter; here the focus is on what I have had to say about it as a form of SD. I acknowledge in the 'Going with the Grain' chapter my investigation of mentoring and subsequent writing about it had a major impact on my development of both mentoring policy and practice at University of Nottingham. When head of SD at that University, I actively encouraged colleagues to engage in action research. Outputs include books on teaching and learning (Exley and Dennick 2004; Haines 2004). In *Strategic Leadership* I identify researching practice as a key feature of the expertise of the strategic leader of SD, whose development needs to parallel that of academic staff.

Strategic Leader. The *Strategic Leadership* paper further develops the notion of professionalizing both the academic staff role and in parallel with it the staff developer's role (*Strategic Leadership in Academic Development*, with Blackmore, P). I have dealt with the professionalizing strategy *per se* in the previous chapter. This section is concerned with leaders of SD. The empirical study of SD Leaders in the paper tends to suggest an eclectic group and worries about capability and capacity mentioned in earlier papers are further developed. A new aspect is the emphasis on staff developers engaging in academic like activities, in investigating their own practice for example, in order to enhance engagement with their academic staff colleagues. This leads to the identification of qualities of leaders as follows.

- Holistic conception of faculty role and developing a varying combination of faculty-like experiences in teaching, research, management and leadership, knowledge transfer and civic engagement.

- Expertise in and recognition of different forms of learning, including situated tacit, informal learning.
- Strategically-engaged at institutional level, leading continuous organizational learning and the ability to work across diverse communities within HEIs.
- Engaging in and promoting evidence-based practice, especially promoting applied social science approaches, while recognizing as valid and drawing upon different conceptions of what constitutes 'evidence' across the academy.
- Ability to work ethically in complex situations.

(*Strategic leadership*: 378-84)

The paper concludes with the need to identify the various qualities of leaders of SD and for these to be embedded in programmes of development probably at Masters level, if the leaders of SD wish to maintain and enhance their standing and roles.

Critical Roles: Deviant innovators and tempered radicals. In *Rethinking SD I* address the question of how organizational critics may prosper in and contribute to organizationally aligned SD functions. The 'deviant innovator' contrasts with the conventional 'conformist innovator', seeking to put their work on a more independent professional footing, change some organizational ends and the criteria for evaluation of their activities rather than accepting as given organizational prescriptions (Legge 1978). It is a role that accords with notions of double loop learning, but is probably only available to the Heads of SD and in times of expansion. Tempered Radicalism, is a dualist strategy of ambivalence. According to Meyerson and Scully (1995) "Tempered Radicals are individuals who identify with and are committed to their organizations and are also committed to a cause, community or ideology that is fundamentally different from and possibly at odds with the dominant culture of their organization". Such a stance may benefit the organization at times of step change or in particular policy areas because tempered radicals are more easily able to engage in 'triple loop learning' and think outside the box. It is most likely to flourish in a relaxed institutional funding regime, when the function has independent access to external project funding, or as a minor part of a more organizationally focused activity" (p 13). However, there is a further reason for tolerating and encouraging critics in SD connected with how to engage the disengaged and the consequences of so doing. Although "the balance of input needs to continue to shift from emphasis on individual academic members of staff towards greater organizational alignment at both the institutional and departmental level" (P 14), as the "learning works" initiative at the University of Glasgow has shown (Davies and Maclauchlan 2003), organizational benefit can derive from programmes based on the wants of (excluded) individuals. Thus "the analytical distinction between individually focused and organizationally focused development is in practice blurred and the relative gain from learning is often shared in somewhat unpredictable proportions" (p 14). Over-engineering an organizational focus or limiting staff engagement to provision directly related to the job (a common temptation for line managers in technical and support staff areas) may be counter-productive for the organization in the longer term. It is the critics who are most likely consistently to challenge such tendencies.

Summary: A change-oriented, transformed SD function?

This chapter has focused on more recent work, building on previous approaches, characterized in an earlier chapter as 'Going with the Grain' and going beyond concern with managerialism and how to respond constructively to it. In this chapter

the focus has been on orienting the SD community to organizational and strategic change agendas, introducing perspectives from outside HE to inform understanding and action, and to develop the implications of engaging with change for the roles of SD and staff developers. Although treated as separate for the purposes of analysis, roles have been conceptualized as located within an integrated, multi-faceted function (*Rethinking* focusing on the needs of all staff and *Strategic Leadership* on faculty only). In practice roles will often overlap and the skilled and successful practitioner will have the facility to move between (at least some of) them as required by context and circumstances, choosing prudently and ethically. The overall function will also be able to offer less strategically salient training as well as critical, challenging perspectives and projects which may not on the surface connect with short term, organizational change programmes. The intention has been to suggest an ambitious, strategically-engaged, and integrated-function transformed from earlier disengaged shop floor models, unfocussed training provider or narrowly focused educational developer orientations. In the process, the need for SD to enhance its own capacity and capability has been identified (see *Changing SD* and *Rethinking*) and an approach for leaders of SD suggested (see *Strategic Leadership*).

Other aspects of significance lie in the way this work was embedded within national projects that involved widespread dissemination activity through conferences and the like and produced enduring resources beyond the papers submitted. For example, early versions of *Promoting QE* were presented at the AAHE annual conference in 2002 and at the European Association for Institutional Research annual conference 2003. Ideas in *Strategic Leadership* were presented and discussed at a SEEDA conference in 2003. My co-author, Paul Blackmore, subsequently obtained a Leadership Foundation grant to develop this work further and a pamphlet (on Capability Development) will be published in 2006. I participated in the project focus group and commented on drafts (my work role did not allow fuller engagement). *Changing HE* arose from a project which I led within LTSN. This produced a number of high quality commissioned papers which are available on the HE academy web site (www.heacademy.ac.uk >resources > academy resources >resources database >facilitating change, last accessed 25 July 2006). There are 7 items including "Changing SD". There were a number of presentations within LTSN too.

A number of sub claims can be derived from these main points:

- To have connected the SD agenda with organizational change and looking beyond traditional borders of initial training and teaching and learning so that the desire of many SD professionals for strategic engagement can become a reality rather than a frustrating (because thwarted) aspiration. Moreover, I would claim to have set out in recent publications an ambitious agenda for the SD function and its leaders.
- Introducing a literature from outwith HE that helps to conceptualize change and identify the need for the HE SD function to develop its own capacity and capability. In this work I am seeking both to make a contribution to the ways in which staff developers think about change, to move from naive but comforting 'truth, trust, love and collaboration' orientations, towards more complex and sophisticated understandings that are required when dealing

directly with challenges to, advocacy of and engagement with stakeholder and personal interests.

- I have directly addressed the need for the SD community to develop itself in order to enable it to engage with the new roles and ambitious strategic vision I have set out, notably in *Changing SD, Rethinking SD* and *Strategic Leadership*. Although I have not used the word 'transformation', for many that is what will be needed to engage with change on any scale and to rise to the challenges of strategic roles.
- To have promoted partnership and collaboration,(the need to share and converge agenda) to achieve change and impact.
- To have developed and elaborated the implications of engaging in organizational and system change for the roles of the SD practitioner, including the head of the SD function, while underlining potentially positive impacts of critical roles on organizational learning.

Chapter 5: Methodological Matters

Introduction

My publications on HE have adopted an eclectic and varied range of methods and methodologies. These selections have largely been pragmatic and governed by questions of fitness for purpose, resources and support, time availability and so on. Pragmatic but not I would argue unprincipled or unjustifiable or merely random. In order to support this statement, I discuss some particular examples of methods I have employed and demonstrate their suitability to the investigations concerned. Subsequently I give an overview of my work, drawing on Knight (2002) and a recent, comprehensive overview of HE research (Tight 2003), as well as a range of more general texts. Finally, I turn to ethics in research, especially the question of access and informed consent.

Utilizing Appropriate Methods

In this section I show how I have sought to match methods to the aims of studies and sampling opportunities available to me, deriving proportionate and appropriate conclusions. I take two areas to illustrate my approach, namely mentor support and PTT representing my dominant forms of research, action research and case study research respectively. The former was pursued through an extended study in two parts and generated three publications (*Mentor 1*, 2 and 3) in the mid 1990s and the latter through two separate studies that generated two more recent papers (*TC* and *PTT* papers).

The papers on mentoring grew from action research (with Monica McLean) designed to test conventional assumptions and prescriptions about mentoring in academic environments with a view to developing appropriate schemes of mentor support, especially from the perspectives of departments and mentees. In order to achieve these aims, I chose multiple methods involving various forms of feedback from key actors, cross referenced with broader survey evidence gathered from within two HEIs. As a result of this triangulation of evidence, not only did I publish on the subject but I developed a new model of mentoring for HE environments and changed the mentoring system (and my recommendations for it) at the University of Nottingham. I was careful to identify the need for additional research on outcomes and effectiveness (e.g. in *Mentor 1* and 2) since my claims relate to 'fit' with academic cultures and preferences of mentees.

Mentor 1 proceeds by "drawing on the literature and relating it to evidence and experience from our own institutions" (page 24). In the case of the University of Nottingham this involved written and oral feedback on a consultation exercise on mentoring from departments; feedback from new lecturers undergoing training in teaching (in writing and orally at events); written feedback from those undergoing mentor and mentee training and, finally, evidence from a questionnaire survey of all academic and academic related staff in 1995 (34.3 response). This evidence base included negative comment on proposals derived from conventional thinking as well as positive examples and endorsement of informality and peer interaction. In the case of the University of Keele the evidence base is the portfolios submitted by new staff undergoing training for assessment, which included comment on the mentor scheme, and second reports provided by mentors on the progress of their mentees. In both

HEIs these methods were supplemented by lightly structured participant observation at training and evaluation events and in the case of the University of Nottingham documentary analysis of extant schemes (submitted by departments). Some 'grey' literature of unpublished surveys and policy documents from neighbouring HEIs were also examined.

Mentor 2 draws on a wider base of literature than previously and new feedback and survey work. It focuses on the role of the mentor. Evidence that the previous work on mentoring (*Mentor 1*) has affected practice at University of Nottingham is mentioned. This includes discussion with heads of departments on the feedback from previous mentor experiences and the publication in 1996 of a new staff development handbook with a section on mentoring to guide departments. At Keele, the comments of new staff on the value of the mentoring relationship were circulated to mentors. *Mentor 3* marshals the arguments developed about mentoring from previous papers and presents them to the members of the main professional body advocating conventional, hierarchical mentoring, the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development. It draws on evidence from the health service as well as HE..

This study of mentoring led me to the conclusion that the emerging orthodoxy of formal centralized schemes, based on hierarchical models of learning, and accompanied by prescriptive regulations and training, were at odds with some academic cultures and the expressed preferences of many mentored staff. From this, I develop an alternative fourfold model of mentoring along dimensions of formal/informal and hierarchy/peer relations and learning. In both *Mentor 1 and 2* I conclude by asserting the need for further research as well as, at a practical level, ongoing evaluation within organizations and sensitive handling of examples of apparent failure.

A contrasting example is my work on PTT. Both main studies in this area used case study methodologies. Case studies are known to be strong at in depth examination of behaviours, processes and rationales but care is needed in generalizing from findings and defining the boundaries of cases. The *TC study* (with Joanna Channel and John Wilson) aimed to test whether TCs are a viable SD strategy for PTT in a variety of departmental settings and if so, under what conditions and with what implications. It focuses on four contrasting case study schools at University of Nottingham which had agreed to take part in the one year experiment, all with a view to enhancing their support of PTT. Principal data collection methods were 'before and after' interviews, observation of TC meetings, feedback from collective discussion (written and oral) and email discussion with departmental leaders and TC conveners, all undertaken by commissioned researchers. Findings included apparent successes (TC continuing without external aid and is valued) and failures (TC collapsed or resisted and not valued). Careful analysis of predisposing conditions (structural, historical and attitudinal) is shown to be essential, with proposals tailored to these circumstances as progress is highly context-specific. Extant provision of other forms of support for PTT (e.g. mentoring, workshops) may pre-dispose participants to question the value added of TCs and 'ownership' by those involved emerges as a key variable for this and potentially other change oriented initiatives. This case study work notes potential boundary issues (part of a school withdraws, part of another school was not included from the outset) and by implication considers them in its conclusions. It is noteworthy that in this study, I was at one remove from the fieldwork (which was

carried out by commissioned researchers). The researchers stimulated and set up the experiments, evaluated them and handed over their findings for subsequent reflection and action.

In *PTT* study (with Colin Bryson), I explain the approach and rationale as follows.

....“The study sought to adopt a focused approach to gathering evidence about emergent strategies on PTT. Our research questions address:

- To what extent are differing human resourcing approaches to PTT being proposed and adopted?
- What drivers and rationales do managers identify behind their thinking and choices?
- What are the current outcomes and likely future consequences of these approaches?

In order to gain sufficient breadth and detail about managers' perspectives and take account of local context, we opted for a case study approach at the level of the individual HEI. Previous research (e.g. Husbands and Davis, 2001) demonstrated that few HE institutions have engaged in any management activity in this sphere.

Accordingly, institutions were selected using a purposive approach. HEIs using proactive approaches to PTT issues were sought and identified through formal network contacts, such as HE personnel managers. At the same time we wished to represent both the diversity of UK HE and areas of heavy PTT utilization. Hence, five cases were selected for study (2 HE colleges, one large specialist HE College, an 'old' or pre-1992 university and a 'new' or post-1992 university). Each was visited on one or more occasions between March and August 2003. Semi-structured interviews were conducted, recorded and each case was fully written up. Material is presented here in such a way as to protect anonymity of interviewees and organizations.

The interviewees in each case consisted of 'strategy makers' and academic heads of department/school. The scope deliberately focused on strategies and precluded evidence from PTT themselves although we can rely on other studies for this voice (including previous studies by the authors). Interviewees always included the Director of HR or equivalent, an individual at Director/Pro-Vice Chancellor level responsible for academic matters and the person responsible for academic staff development, although this latter role was not always at a strategic level, hereafter the 'strategists'. At least three heads of academic department/school were interviewed in each HEI too (hereafter 'academic heads') and we scrutinized formal strategy and policy documents" (p210-11).

This approach enabled identification of the continuum of strategic responses at HEI level, the justifications offered by senior managers and the ambiguities and paradoxes in implementation derived from the needs of local heads and PTT themselves.

Although the case studies prompt scepticism about claims of strategic efficacy from both ends of the continuum of responses identified (and especially the differentiator end), the paper is careful not to over generalize about extensiveness or sector wide impacts. Some boundary issues are identified as adding complexity, especially around minorities of PTT in particular disciplines who favour relationships contrary to the dominant HEI model (for example high status professional musicians favouring transactional relationships where more holistic, integrative approaches were officially promoted). The study is at one further remove from action than the TC study.

Overview of Methodologies

In presenting this overview, I utilize Knight's framework Knight (2002) rather than that of Tight (Tight 2003) because Tight adopts a categorization which abolishes forms of research that have been central to my practice, notably action research and case study research. Knight's multi-level analysis allows these forms to be retained and specifies methods which have been central to my work. That said, I wish to distinguish 'practitioner research' as a 'form' from action research, which adds to Knight's account of research forms although arguably this is close to Gray's distinction between 'internal' and 'external' action research (Gray 2004: 376) and therefore might not be seen as a separate form of research endeavour by some. It reflects the differences identified in the above discussion in the extent to which I was immersed in the practical project and taking forward action, as distinct from making findings available to practitioners to consider and, if appropriate, action.

Knight draws out four elements in small scale research: taking a methodological stance, adopting stand points, applying appropriate forms of research and using the right mix of tools. In relation to methodological stances, Knight contrasts: realism and positivism with their opposite, anti realism and post structuralism. Critical realism and pragmatism are located in between (Knight 2002 table 2.1 pp 28-32). I have taken this third position, accepting the independent existence of a physical world, but seeing most else as socially shaped, generally taking what Knight refers to as the 'coherence view' towards what we may know. Outside of the natural sciences knowledge is not wholly secure and... 'the thing is true if it is consistent with other evidence – that from practice for example' (Knight 2002: 28). In some contexts and studies, for instance the large scale research study on new managerialism in the civil service (*NM* paper), the approach adopted tends more towards the realist position. In the case of later work, notably that on academic identity and discipline-based change, my position is nearer to an anti realist one in which truth is seen as highly situated, contingent and being constructed and reconstructed (or to 'naturalistic' research approaches Cohen, Manion and Morrison 2000 pp 5-48). In addition to face validity, which I have sought to achieve in all work, another approach I have consistently adopted to validity is that of triangulation, that is to say what Cohen et al (2000: 113) describe as 'methodological triangulation' in which a number of methods are brought to bear on a particular object of study, as illustrated above. This helps to give some confidence in (at least concurrent) validity, although even this claim is not without its critics (Cohen et al 2000 pp 112-115).

The second element in Knight's approach to 'claims making' is that of taking a 'standpoint'. I have taken a standpoint between post structuralism's emphasis on pervasive subjectivity or realist assumptions about the need and availability of 'objectivity'. I value objectivity but know it is difficult to achieve in practice-based social enquiry and have remained conscious of my own career baggage, interests and contextual influences. The opportunity to approach the same issue in different studies and from varying angles has provided one way of seeking greater confidence in overall conclusions, built cumulatively (see below).

Forms of Research

The third element is forms of research. Knight identifies three typical forms of small scale research: action research, evaluations and case studies. Tight rejects all three of these forms as too vague, overlapping and lacking utility for categorization (Tight

2003 8-10). Instead he suggests an eight fold classificatory system which is easy to use and could be applied to my work. However this system rather conflates methods (tools) and methodologies (paradigms), as he recognizes, nor did it actually influence the way I worked.

Much of my work has many of the characteristics of **action research**, being collaborative and closely linked to making a difference and following something close to an action research pattern (see Gray 2004: 377-83, Cohen 2005:226-241). Much HE publication claims to be based on action research although one unusual feature of some output is that I have actually followed up on some areas of research and assessed the action taken. For example, in the case of POT my publication in 1996 was based on action taken at the University of Nottingham from which I advocated a particular model of POT and argued for its potentially extensive impact. I returned to this theme in my LTSN work 2000-2003 as a national agent and this enabled me to review a range of experience with POT across UK, Australasian and American HE. One consequence of this was that I identified five underlying models (of which my original was but one) with different implications and purposes. Second, this exploration led me to realize that POT needs to be seen as one mechanism in wider change strategies, for example the scholarship of teaching and learning movement, and that the claims I had previously made to practical impact need to be softened and contextualized. In the case of PTT, I was able to explore different forms of SD in two contexts (see *TC* and *subject dimension* papers) before moving on to examine the development of institutional strategy and the need for a holistic approach to the employment relationship (*PTT* paper).

One criticism of action research is that there is often too little thinking at the outset, (Knight quoting Chetland and Holwell (1998)) and this can be applied to some of my own early work (see comments above about POT). Moreover the typical pattern for action research, (see, Cohen et al 2000) in which there is a rational approach characterized by sequence of logical steps conceptualized as part of a circle or spiral is a rather idealized way of presenting much of what happens in HE. In fact it is much messier, partly reflecting the messiness of change processes themselves (see McNiff and Whitehead 2002: 70-2 for recognition of this) and the developing expertise of users, in which I would include myself. Since research was not the primary objective of some projects at the outset, the sequence of rational steps often set out for action research is really rather jumbled, data collection and so on being initially rather haphazard and undertaken in parallel with other logically prior steps. Subsequent remedying action to fill in gaps, develop a fuller understanding of the relevant literature and so on may be quite common. My own view is that the SD community has become more conscious of the opportunities and therefore more purposeful in setting out on practical tasks, seeing from the outset the potential benefits of undertaking practical activity as a research task and reading and writing about it. This reflects my own personal journey with approaches becoming more systematic over time.

Unusually Knight includes **evaluation** as a form of research (pp 40-41). In my case the TC publication might be regarded as overlapping with this category since the publication was partly based on the evaluation report of the experiment by commissioned consultants (who were co-authors). Other publications, especially earlier ones, make use of evaluation evidence gathered directly from participants,

(notably on POT and mentoring, the training and development of new teachers) but none of these could be described as based around evaluation studies *per se*.

My background in industrial relations and management studies involved extensive training in using case study methods. I have employed these throughout most of my publications while always attempting to be sensitive to the constraints and limitations of the method: notably that the way the case is defined, the boundaries that are set, may influence the findings and, secondly, the need for caution in generalizing from one or a few cases. In this way I have attempted wherever possible to ensure a number of cases are included, enabling comparison and giving greater confidence in interpretations of data. I have always sought to place the work in the contexts of the existing literature too.

I would claim to utilization of a fourth form of small scale research, **practitioner focused research**. This form of research has the same close connections with practice, practical problems and commonly a collaboratively element but not the same direct connection with action or assumption of precipitating desirable change as action research. There is more a sense of standing back and turning over findings to practitioners for their consideration and action, if appropriate (for an example see Lovey 2000). This has been evident in later work I have done on PTT outlined previously but also on SD strategy and strategic thinking (e.g. in *Rethinking SD* and *Strategic Leadership*), effectively summarizing my own position derived from a number of years publication, research and practical engagement. As the earlier discussion shows this form may overlap with the case study mode. It is at one remove from practitioners as compared, for example in working with practitioners on POT or mentoring.

Collaboration

Action and practitioner research involves collaboration with others and much of my work has led to co-authored pieces, reflecting this fact. Also relevant is my preference for working with others, especially in new areas or when different areas of expertise are desirable or simply when others with things to offer are willing and able to help (as major or minor partners). Over time I have found that I develop my ideas best through dialogue and discussion, including with those who have different stances to my own. An early experience as an RA on my first contract (Undy and Martin 1984) left me with a view that all those who contribute should be acknowledged in the authoring of papers. Thus I have undertaken investigations and writing with educational specialists (e.g. McLean), Organization Studies/HR specialists (Bryson, Lloyd, Preece), Engineers (Ratchev and Bonney), Staff and Educational Development specialists (Blackmore, Gibbs, D'Andrea, Gosling), work colleagues (Allan) and commissioned project workers (Channel and Wilson). In some cases I wrote discrete (more or less large) parts and commented on the rest, and in some cases I wrote the whole of the final draft. As a result of this eclectic range of collaborators I also had one experience of engaging with soft systems methodology, although this was largely at the instigation of my co-authors, Ratchev and Bonney (see the *Bulgarian* paper).

Methods or Research Tools

There is also the question of the extent to which my work utilizes the range of tools of the methodological trade. Knight identifies 21 research methods or potential research methods in small scale research (Knight 2002 table 5.1 pp 111-8). I have

used at least 12 in my publications and of these, six of the ‘unobtrusive methods’ very frequently (semi-structured observation, semi-structured questionnaires, observing by being there, lightly structured interviews, memory work and analysis of documents), as I illustrated in the examples at the beginning of this chapter.

Access and informed consent

Questions of access and informed consent can be problematic in HE action research, when looking at HE ‘close up’. In many of my empirical studies access has been negotiated and the ways in which the findings might be used discussed at the outset (e.g. *NM* and *PTT* papers). In other overview publications the question has not arisen directly (for example in *Rethinking SD*). In other cases the data was gathered as a result of project work, for example the article on *Bulgaria* and *subject dimension* to *SD*. For the *Bulgarian* paper the notion of a publication was checked with the project sponsors and Bulgarian colleagues and in the *subject dimension* case studies were actually gathered from participants in the projects and their publication was generally seen as being in their interests in disseminating the work of the bodies concerned (LTSN subject centres). In these instances there was an implicit assumption that authors would behave responsibly in writing up the work, respecting confidences, protecting (or publicizing) individuals’ identity as appropriate. Some of my early work however did draw on feedback gathered for other purposes (evaluating mentoring schemes or the quality of training events) and while the same conventions in terms of anonymity and so on were applied not all the participants were aware that they were involved in something that would ultimately be written up for publication. In the *POT* article the one department that was named and discussed most was consulted (and was happy to have what it regarded as a relatively successful change strategy placed in the public domain). Nonetheless participants in new teacher training and some of the *POT* schemes analyzed in my early work were not aware of their involvement in a potential study. With the benefit of hindsight, this lack of explicit agreement makes me uneasy. In fact, nobody complained and the university senior management was pleased to see the work publicized. For example, I had a personal note of thanks and congratulations from the registrar at University of Nottingham, who had funded relevant conference participation, after the *POT* and *Opportunity Knocks* articles and a *PVC* commented upon *Mentor* articles 1 and 2. There were advantages too in better access to intentions and motives, privileged insights and information, the testing of ideas in authentic ways and so on which mitigate the sense of uneasiness.

Conclusion

Overall, the research presented here can be characterized as interpretive research, utilizing opportunity sampling and multiple methods to achieve validity. In terms of the framework developed by Knight, my approaches have been informed by a ‘methodological stance’, ‘standpoints’ and adopted appropriate forms (see Knight 2002 pp 16-46), although as with much HE research, these have often been implicit (see Tight 2003 pp 8-10). I have mainly made use of three somewhat overlapping forms of research, namely action, practitioner-focused and case study research, and a variety of unobtrusive methods associated with them. Questions of access and informed consent point toward an area in which my investigative practice has become more rigorous over time.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

Introduction

This final chapter seeks to summarise and develop the main claims for originality and significance made in the individual chapters. Second, the chapter aims to reflect upon the output and identify aspects that would benefit from updating or further work. Third, the chapter offers some thoughts about areas for future research derived from the papers and emerging research opportunities. It therefore seeks to contribute to two of the criteria sometimes taken to be key dimensions in the assessment of scholarship, namely 'significance' of the output and 'reflective critique' (Glassick, Huber and Maeroff 1997). It begins by summarising and developing claims before turning to a more discursive treatment of areas for potential updating and future research.

Claims

It would be tedious to repeat all the claims made in the individual chapters so here I concentrate on the overarching claims. Two stand out:

1. To have introduced thinking, concepts and findings from HRM, industrial relations, and related subjects. This has enabled understanding to be advanced, practice to have been developed and the SD community to have been challenged and stimulated to develop its own capacity and capability.
2. To have contributed a specific understanding of strategic SD focussed on organisational impact, and how it might positively contribute to organisational learning. Also, I spelled out some key consequences for SD orientations and development.

Below this mid-range conceptual development, I would claim to have made other important contributions to knowledge. These include

- Confirming the second order nature of HR strategies (see Jackson 2001).
- Identifying the continuum of strategic choice employed by HEIs towards their PTT and some of the implications of the choices.
- Challenging traditional assumptions of hierarchy and formality in mentoring schemes.
- Setting out a framework for understanding NM that raises interesting research questions and to have advocated a professionalizing response.
- To have shown the desirability and need for collaborations and alliances to effect enhancement both within HEIs and externally on the national stage.

In terms of the original research questions I outlined in the introduction, I have offered focussed output and analysis of various related and indicative topics. I hope to have provided a clear conception of strategic SD while recognising real world complexity and ambiguity. I, of course, recognise that there are uncertainties over terminology and concepts of SD (*Changing HE* and *Strategic Leadership* refer to 'academic development') and other conceptions of 'strategic SD' too (see for example Knight, Tait and Yorke 2006:336).

In terms of significance and contributions to quality enhancement, I have mentioned in previous chapters, amongst other things, the major projects I was involved in leading (on POT, PTT, and change), dissemination activities associated with them and the substantial legacy of high quality resources that they have left. In addition, the POT and mentoring papers together with subsequent feedback indicated actual changes to practice both within the sites studied and beyond their boundaries. In terms of citation, 'Google Scholar' identified 30 citations for 7 of the papers and the co-edited book although I am unable to calibrate that data. Data from the publishers of my co-edited book (which contains four of the main items submitted) does however contain useful comparison with the immediate predecessor collection in the same series (Brew 1995). Malie Lalor, Product & Promotions Manager, Open University Press wrote in an email dated 5 April 2005 that

"2003 sales: 300 PB and 47 HB

2004 sales: 276 PB and 61 HB

2005 - 20 PB and 1HB to date.

Total 596 PB and 109 HB.

When I compare this to sales for the large majority of our HE books, it looks like it has matched and even exceeded expectations. It is a bit more difficult to compare like for like for Brew Directions in SD, as I don't have a year-by-year breakdown.

However, considering that life sales for Brew is approximately 1167 copies over the 10 years for which it has been in print, I think Towards Strategic SD compares well and we have reason to be satisfied with the book's performance....". I have recently heard (24 July 2006) that the total sales for 2005 were in fact 103 giving a total in the first three years of 808.

Future Research

I turn now to the research agenda arising from the body of work reviewed herein and emerging opportunities connected with my work role. There are a number of ways in which the forgoing work could be re-visited and enhanced. Some of these involve updating due to the passage of time, for example, in relation to the HE Academy and its progress, or to reflect more recent scholarship (e.g. on mentoring and POT). Related to the development of scholarship, there is also the opportunity to develop some concepts and their implications, for example the notion of 'communities of practice'. A recent article, although confirming a collective focus for SD, suggests that this focus should be 'activity systems' which are not identical to communities of practice. That suggests a subtly different way of constituting the individual and system relationship with implications for forms of development (see Knight, Tait and Yorke 2006). The methodology chapter suggests a need for continuing care over questions of access and consent, while noting a trend away from close-to-practice action research towards more distant 'practitioner research' in my work.

The approach I have adopted suggests a broad notion of SD. In the Introduction I raised the boundary question that arises from my inclusive approach to SD: what are the conceptual and practical boundaries of staff development? The implication of my investigations is that an answer will be largely contingent and difficult to specify precisely outside of particular ecologies. In *Departmental SD*, however, I briefly discuss the need for sensitivity to organisational patterns, drawing on the work of Becher (1989) and Sawbridge (1996). My concept of strategic SD suggests one way of approaching this issue at organisational level, not explored in my work, would be

to relate boundary issues to the type of HEI. Clegg and McAuley (2005) and McNay (1995) have suggested classifications which could help with the practical task of providing guidance for those seeking to review or design SD provision in particular types of HEI. At first sight, this appears to be a relatively straight forward area for development which would not require much additional investigative work.

A number of areas for empirical research suggest themselves based on the foregoing. There is a huge literature on professionalism and there is scope to further develop conceptually what we mean by 'professionalism in HE', for both academic staff and SD practitioners as there are clearly a number of discourses, including in my own work. There are also further potential questions for research around 'professionalisation' as a strategic response to managerialism (in my earlier work) and as a strategy for establishing a strategic leadership role for SD (later work). The position I have developed on strategic SD raises the question of how the SD professional and function strikes the right balance between different impulses (top down, bottom up and middle in and out) in order to maintain the confidence of stakeholders and have real impact. Second, the work on HR strategy (in *PTT*) suggested it was largely a second order priority prompting thoughts about the priority accorded to SD in HEIs. Research questions include, in what circumstances it is necessary for SD functions to adjust the weight given to the different impulses and how can that change be achieved without sacrificing stakeholder support? To what extent, does the nature and organisation of the function really make any difference to its standing?

An example of the kind of work that is required (in a different sector and from HR) is Hope Hailey, Farndale, and Truss's (2005) longitudinal case study of 'success bank'. It shows a complex picture of an improving HR department alongside high level financial performance but declining employee commitment and morale. They argue that as the HR function increasingly adopted a 'strategic partnering role', serving management through consultancy and the like, it became less visibly committed to and connected with the needs of employees. The primacy of business strategy and the needs of shareholders led to a short term focus on financial results and a cost reduction strategy, which included reduced head count, and lost it support amongst staff. Once the short term performance fell off, which in financial terms it did dramatically, there was no sustainable basis on which the HR department could motivate and engage employees, especially as it had made the fatal mistake of devolving operational HR responsibility to line managers, who were largely driven by sales targets. The HR department emerges, within this setting, as both contributing towards organizational performance in the short term, but having neglected the employee champion role and growing signs of discontent. In the longer term, the department is thought to have contributed to the declining financial performance, only realizing too late that to turn this round they needed to draw on the by now weak commitment of employees (Hope Hailey, Farndale, and Truss (2005)). Much of the empirical work in HRM is concerned with the so-called 'black box' issue of the relationship between HRM and organisational performance, and discussion of SD strategy could usefully draw on it for insights and, particularly, examples of the type of studies required (for discussion of the state of knowledge on the link between HR and performance see HRMJ 2005).

In the chapter on managerialism and professionalism I identified some outstanding research questions. Why did NM come so late to HE and what does that tell us about the current system of HE in the UK that is worth preserving? How is it likely to develop and with what implications for staff and stakeholders? The literature on the 'new public management' is suggestive on the latter questions (e.g. McLaughlin, Osborne, and Ferlie, 2002). The former set of questions is more intriguing. A key aspect of the English HE system is the interaction between the funding councils and HEIs on the one hand and Government on the other, what some regard as HE's own 'black box'. Mainly I work at one remove from this although crises in politically salient areas can elevate local issues onto the national stage (see Science and Technology Committee 2006). There is therefore, some opportunity to observe and to reflect upon the extent to which, for example, impulses towards NM and the new public management originate in different parts of the system, are promoted, elaborated, forestalled or mitigated by different bodies. Moreover as an intermediary working with and frequently visiting senior management teams at HEIs, there is an opportunity to observe and reflect upon their role in NM as they often seem to be the 'prime suspects' (see Watson 2000 6-8). Considerations of confidentiality and integrity constrain the prospects for investigating and writing about these phenomena in the short term but my role may provide opportunities for future research.

As well as my regional role, I have a national role in relation to 'third stream' or 'knowledge transfer', activity a developing area of funding and policy. I am actively engaged with the policy making process and have opportunities to investigate the various mutation theories about HE in this area (e.g. Slaughter and Leslie's (1997) 'academic capitalism', Gibbons mode 2 knowledge production (Gibbons et al 1994)) and the implications for the academic role and identity. In many ways this connects most strongly with my past work, may have long run significance for the impact of HE on economy and society and may be easier to write about (as part of the policy formation process).

An obvious starting point for me is Boyer's work on scholarship (Boyer 1990) and especially the scholarship of application (now usually referred to as 'engagement'). In common with his other scholarships, he has little to say on its nature except two rather important things. He distinguishes between general 'service' activities and this sub-set "...to be considered scholarship, these activities must be tied directly to one's special field of knowledge and relate to and flow directly out of this professional activity' (p22) which should be subject to the normal rigour and accountability associated with research. Furthermore he adds that the 'term itself may be misleading' that the process should be seen as interactive, two way and dynamic, that new understandings may arise from the act of application, in fact utilising the term 'scholarly service' (p23). In Boyer's work this scholarship is one of four scholarships, which are usually conceptualised as four overlapping circles, which fits with linear conceptions of knowledge transfer, now under challenge in the UK especially from the creative and cultural arts and industries. Here the argument is that 'knowledge transfer' arises from within interactions (e.g. inter-disciplinary, experimental performances) which are at the same time research and sometimes teaching too (Crossick 2006). A common suggestion derived from this argument is that there may be radical differences in knowledge transfer between science and engineering disciplines (from which the linear model emanates) and arts, humanities and parts of social sciences. However a further thought is that this 'scholarship of engagement' may not be

separately conceptualised but potentially embedded across the traditional duality of research and teaching. Related to these points is the 'unbundling' hypothesis: The observation on both sides of the Atlantic that a new division of labour may be emerging with newly constituted jobs focussed on only part of the academic role, or, that academic staff may be encouraged and/or choose to focus explicitly on more carefully delineated parts of their whole role at particular times in their career but with the prospect or opportunity to have covered the whole role over a career. The debate about knowledge transfer and its conceptualisation may suggest some limits to this process in some disciplinary areas, as well as questioning the applicability of the four scholarships model to the entire academy. A number of research questions suggest themselves including: what is the nature of third stream activity and how does its development impact on the academic role? Are there significant variations across the academy and its institutions? How useful are mutation theories and Boyer's scholarship model in conceptualising and explaining the activity?

Coda

In this output, therefore, I make claims to originality and significance, albeit shared with some co-authors, in the sense of tackling existing problems in new ways and providing an ambitious and challenging conceptualization of SD in HE. In this practitioner and applied, action oriented area, I have aimed to contribute to mid-range conceptual development, an objective appropriate to my role, opportunities and resources. It is encouraging in this context to see my co-edited book referred to as setting out a discourse for administration middle managers equivalent to at least one of those associated with academic middle management (Clegg and McAuley 2005: 20) on the one hand, and on the other, reference to it as an exemplification of one concept of strategic SD (Knight, Tait, Yorke 2006: 336). There are outstanding research questions arising from the studies which my role may present opportunities to investigate in future. One new area, 'third stream' or knowledge transfer, presents exciting opportunities, connects with my predominant foci on academic work and quality enhancement, and would continue my research journey from its original origins in narrowly conceived SD.

References

(Excludes own papers submitted for assessment)

- Aldridge, M and Evetts, J (2003) Rethinking the Concept of Professionalism: The Case of Journalism. **British Journal of Sociology**, 54(4) 547-64.
- Barnett, R (2000) **Realizing the University in an Age of Supercomplexity**. Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.
- Becher, T (1989) **Academic Tribes and Territories**. Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.
- Becher, T. and Trowler, P.R. (2001) **Academic Tribes and Territories**, 2nd Edition, Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.
- Bennetts, C (2003) Mentoring Youth: trend and tradition. **British Journal of Guidance and Counselling**, 31(1) 163-76.
- Bennetts, C (2001) Lifelong learners: in their own words. **International Journal of Lifelong Education**, 20(4) 272-288.
- Billett, S (2004) Learning in the Workplace: Reappraisals and Preconceptions, in Hayward, G and James, S **Balancing the Skills Equation: Key Issues and Challenges for Policy and Practice**, 53-76. Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Billett, S. (2002) Workplaces, communities and pedagogy: an activity theory view, in Lea, M. and Nicoll, K. (eds.) **Distributed Learning: Social and Cultural Approaches to Practice**, 83-97. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Blackwell, R (2003) 'Bring this supply in from the cold', **THES** 28 February: 23.
- Blackwell, R (2002) 'Watching me, watching you', **THES** 15 March: 16-7.
- Boyer, E. (1990) **Scholarship reconsidered: priorities of the professoriate**. New Jersey: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Brew, A (ed) (1995) **Directions in Staff Development**. Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.
- Bryson, C (2004) **Hiring Lecturers by the Hour**. London: NATFHE.
- Bryson, C. and Blackwell, R. (2001) **Teaching Quality and Part Time Teachers in HE**. York: LTSN Generic Centre.
- Buchanan, D. and Badham, R. (1999) **Power Politics and Organisational Change: Winning the Turf Game**. London: Sage.
- Checkland, P and Holwell, S (1998) Action Research: Its Nature and Validity. **Systemic Practice and Action Research**, 11(1) 9-21.
- Clegg, S, and McAuley, J (2005) Conceptualising Middle Management in Higher Education: A Multi Faceted Discourse. **Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management**, 27(1) 19-34.
- Cohen, L; Manion, L and Morrison, K (2000) **Research Methods in Education** Fifth Edition. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Crossick, G (2006) **Knowledge Transfer Without Widgets: the challenge of the creative economy**. Royal Society of Arts Lecture, Leeds, 31 May.
- Cuthbert, R (2002) **Constructive Alignment in the World of Institutional Management**. Imaginative Curriculum Symposium. York: Learning and Teaching Support Network.
- D'Andrea, V. and Gosling, D. (2001) Joining the Dots: Reconceptualising Educational Development. **Active Learning**, 2(1) 64-80.

- Davies, G and Maclachlan, K (2003) 'The best hundred pound': Learning works in the University of Glasgow, in Blackwell, R and Blackmore, P (eds) **Towards strategic Staff Development**. Maidenhead: SRHE/Open University Press.
- Deem, R (2003) New Managerialism in UK Universities: Manager-Academics Accounts of Change in Eggins, H (ed) **Globalisation and Reform in Higher Education**. SRHE-Open University Press. Maidenhead: 55-67.
- Deem, R (1998) New Managerialism in Higher Education – The Management of Performances and Cultures in Universities. **International Studies in the Sociology of Education**, 8(1) 47-70.
- Deem, R. and Johnson, R. (2000) Managerialism and University Managers: Building New Academic Communities or Dismantling Old Ones? in McNay, I. (ed.) **Higher Education and their Communities**. Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press: 64-84.
- Exley, K and Dennick, R (2004) **Giving a Lecture**. From presenting to teaching. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Elton, L. (1995) An Institutional Framework, in Brew, A. (ed.) **Directions in Staff Development**. Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.
- Elton, L and Partington, P (1993) **Teaching Standards and Excellence in Higher Education**. Sheffield: CVCP/Universities Staff Development Unit.
- Ferlie, E, Ashburner, L, Fitzgerald, L, and Pettigrew, A (1996) **The New Public Management in Action**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ferner, A (1985) Political Constraints and Management Strategies: The Case of Working Practices in British Rail. **British Journal of Industrial Relations** 13(1).
- Gibbons, M, Limoges, C, Nowotny, H, Schwartzman, S, Scott, P, Trow, M (1994) **The New Production of Knowledge: the Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies**. London: Sage.
- Gibbs, G. and Habeshaw, T. (2002) **Recognising and Rewarding Excellent Teaching**. Milton Keynes: TQEF National Co-ordination Team and Centre for Higher Education Practice.
- Gibbs, G, Pearson, C, Abbas, A, McLean, M, Blackwell, R, Channell, J and Williams, J (2000) **Support for Part-Time Teachers of Social Science**. Milton Keynes: Open University.
- Glassick, C.E., Taylor Huber, M., and Maeroff, G.I. (1997) **Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Gosling, D. (2001) Educational development units in the UK – what are they doing five years on?, **International Journal for Academic Development**, 6 (1) 74-90.
- Gray, D (2004) **Doing Research in the Real World**. London: Sage.
- Haines, C (2004) **Assessing Students Written Work**. Marking essays and reports. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Halford, S. and Savage, M. (1995) 'Restructuring Organisations, Changing People: Gender and Restructuring in Banking and Local Government. **Work, Employment and Society**, 9(1) 97–122.
- Henkel, M. (2000) **Academic Identities and Policy Change in Higher Education**. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- HEFCE (2006) **The Higher Education Workforce in England**. A framework for the future. Bristol: HEFCE.

- Hicks, O. (1999) Integration of Central and Departmental Development – Reflections from Australian Universities. **The International Journal for Academic Development**, 4(1) 43-51.
- Higher Education Quality Council (1996) **Learning from Audit 2**. London: HEQC.
- Hope Hailey, V, Farndale, E and Truss, C, (2005) The HR Department's Role in Organisational Performance. **Human Resource Management Journal**, 15(3) 49-66.
- HRMJ (Human Resource Management Journal) (2005) **Special Issue: The Link between HRM and Performance**.
- Husbands, C. and Davis, A. (2000) The teaching roles, institutional locations, and terms of conditions of employment of part-time teachers in UK Higher Education. **Journal of Further and Higher Education**, 24(3) 337-362.
- Hutchings, P. (1996) **Making Teaching Community Property. A Menu for Peer Collaboration and Peer Review**. Washington DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Jackson, M (2001) Personnel Management in UK Universities. **Personnel Review**, 30(4) 404-20.
- Jackson, N (2003) **Engaging and Changing Higher Education through Brokerage**. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing.
- Jackson, N (2002) **Exploring Enhancement**. York; LTSN Generic Centre.
- Kelly, J (1998) **Rethinking Industrial Relations**. Mobilisation, Collectivism and Long Waves. London: Routledge.
- Kinnie, N (1985) Changing Management Strategies in Industrial Relations. **Industrial Relations Journal** 16(4).
- Knight, P T (2002) **Small Scale Research**. Sage: London.
- Knight, P, Tait, J and Yorke, M (2006) The Professional Learning of Teachers in Higher Education. **Studies in Higher Education**, 31(3) 319-339.
- Kolb, D (1984) **Experiential Learning**. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Land, R. (2001) Agency, Context and Change in Academic Development. **The International Journal for Academic Development**, 6(1) 4-20.
- Legge, K. (1978) **Power, Innovation and Problem Solving in Personnel Management**: London: McGraw-Hill.
- Legge, K. and Exley, M (1975) Authority, ambiguity and adaptation: the personnel specialist's dilemma. **Industrial Relations Journal**, 6(1).
- Lewin, K. (1958) Group decisions and social change, in Swanson, G., Newcomb, T. and Hartley, E. (eds) **Readings in Social Psychology**, Holt, Rhinehart and Winston: New York.
- Lloyd, P, and Blackwell, R (1985) Manpower Economies, Management and Industrial Relations in the Civil Service. **Industrial Relations Journal**, 16(4) 25-37.
- Lovey, J (2000) Researching in Schools: Case Studies Based on 3 Research Projects in Wilkinson (ed) (2000) **The Researchers Tool Kit. The Complete Guide to Practitioner Research**. London: Routledge Falmer 117-131.
- Matheson, C. (1981) **Staff Development Matters**. London: Coordinating Committee for the Training of University Teachers.
- McInnis, C. (1992) Change in the nature of academic work. **The Australian Universities' Review**, 35(2) 9-12.

- McLaughlin, K Osborne, S and Ferlie, E (eds) (2002) **New Public Management. Current trends and future prospects.** London: Routledge.
- McLean, M and Blackwell, R (1995) Training Academics to Teach in Universities of the Future. **Improving University Teaching 20th International Conference Proceedings:** 478-489.
- McNay, I. (1995) From the Collegial Academy to Corporate Enterprise: The Changing Cultures of Universities, in Schuller, T. (ed.) **The Changing University?** Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.
- McNiff, J and Whitehead, J (2002) **Action Research: Principles and Practice (2nd Ed).** London: Routledge Falmer.
- Megginson, D and Clutterbuck, D (1995) **Mentoring in Action.** London: Kogan Page.
- Meyerson, D. and Scully, M. (1995) Tempered Radicalism and the Politics of Ambivalence and Change, **Organisation Science**, 6(5).
- Middlehurst, R., (1997) Enhancing Quality, in F. Coffield, and Williamson **Repositioning Higher Education.** Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.
- Millerson, G (1964) **The Qualifying Associations: A Study in Professionalisation.** London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Pettigrew, A. (1985) **The Awakening Giant: Continuity and Change at ICI,** Oxford: Blackwell.
- Purcell, J (1983) The Management of Industrial Relations in the Modern Corporation: Agenda for Research. **British Journal of Industrial Relations**, 11(1).
- Rust, C. (1998) The Impact of Educational Development Workshops on Teachers Practice. **International Journal for Academic Development**, 3(1) 72-80.
- Sawbridge, M. (1996) **The Politics and Organisational Complexity of Staff Development for Academics: A Discussion Paper.** Sheffield: UCoSDA.
- Science and Technology Committee (2006) **Strategic Science in English Universities: a Follow-up.** Second Report of Session 2005-06 HC 1011. London: The Stationery Office.
- Schon, D, (1983) **The Reflective Practitioner.** New York: Basic Books.
- Slaughter, S. and Leslie, L (1997) **Academic Capitalism: Politics and the Entrepreneurial University.** Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.
- Smith, G. (1992) A categorisation of models of staff development in Higher Education. **British Journal of Educational Technology**, 23 39-47.
- Swanwick, T (2005) Informal Learning in postgraduate medical education: from cognitivism to 'culturism'. **Medical Education**, 39(8) 859-865.
- Swain, H (2002) 'Staff mark limits to growth' **THES** 17 May: 20.
- Tight, M (2003) **Researching Higher Education.** Maidenhead: SRHE/Open University Press.
- Toohey, S (1999) **Designing Courses for Higher Education.** Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.
- Trowler, P (1998) **Academics Responding to Change.** New Higher Education Frameworks and Academic Cultures. Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.
- Trowler, P and Knight, P (2002) Exploring the Implementation Gap: Theory and Practices in Change Interventions in Trowler, P (ed) **Higher Education Policy and Institutional Change: Intentions and Outcomes in Turbulent Environments.** 142-163. Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.

- Trowler, P., Saunders, M., and Knight, P. (2002) **Change Thinking, Change Practices**. York: LTSN Generic Centre.
- Undy, R and Martin, R (1984) **Ballots and Trade Union Democracy**. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Watson, D (2000) **Managing Strategy**. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Webb, G. (1996) **Understanding Staff Development**. Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.

APPENDIX 1

Table 3: CONTRIBUTION TO PUBLICATIONS SUBMITTED
Chronological order by category

Lists showing the author’s contribution to each paper

Refereed Journal Articles

N o	Title, Journal, Co-authors	Total Words	RJB %	RJB words
1	"Peer Observation of Teaching and Staff Development". Higher Education Quarterly Vol. 50 No. 2 1996, 156-71 (with McLean M)	5872	60	3523
2	"Mentors for New Academic Staff". International Journal for Academic Development Vol.1 No.2 1996, 80-5 (with McLean. M)	4394	60	2636
3	"Opportunity Knocks? Professionalism and Excellence in University Teaching" Teachers and Teaching Vol 3 No.1 1997, 85-99 (with McLean M)	7095	25	1774
4	"Teaching Circles: A way forward for part time teachers in Higher Education?" International Journal for Academic Development Vol. 6 No.1 June 2001 40-53 (with Channell J and Wilson J)	7740	33.33	2580
5	'Changing Higher Education'. International Journal of Management Education Vol.1 No.3, 2001 4-14 (with Preece, D)	6171	60	3703
6	'Design of an Industrial Engineering Course in an Emerging Economy: Bringing Together Engineering and Educational Approaches'. European Journal of Engineering Education Vol. 27 No.1 113-129 2002 (with Ratchev S and Bonney M)	6866	40	2746
7	'Promoting Quality Enhancement in the UK - the experience of collaboration'. Tertiary Education And Management , Vol. 11, 55-79 2005 (with Gosling D and D'Andrea V)	8442	30	2533
8	'Managing temporary workers in Higher Education - still at the margin?' Personnel Review Vol. 35 No. 2 2006 (with Bryson C)	7950	40	3180
9	'Strategic Leadership in Academic Development'. Studies in Higher Education Volume 31, Number 3, 373-387 2006 (with Blackmore, P)	3233	50	3,233
	Cumulative Total			25908

Book Chapters

	Chapter title and Book	Total words	RJB %	RJB words
10	"New Managerialism in the Civil Service" in Mailly R et al (eds) Industrial Relations in the Public Services , Routledge 1989, 68-113 (with Lloyd P)	18000	90	16200
11	"Work Based Assessment: The Case of the Graduate Diploma in Employment Relations" in Brown G Assessing Active Learning: Module 11: Effective Teaching and Learning in Higher Education USDTU/CVCP 1992, 83-5	1389	100	1389
12	"Formal Pupil or Informal Peer?" in Fullerton H (ed) Facets Of Mentoring in Higher Education 1 , SEDA Paper 94 1996, 23-31 (with McLean M)	6300	60	3780
13	"Rethinking Strategic Staff Development" in Blackwell R and Blackmore P (eds) Towards Strategic Staff Development , OUP/SRHE, Buckingham 2003 (with Blackmore P)	6090	60	3654
14	'Developing Departments', in Blackwell R and Blackmore P (eds) Towards Strategic Staff Development , OUP/SRHE, Buckingham 2003.	4965	100	4965
15	"Academic Roles and Relationships" in Blackwell R and Blackmore P (eds) Towards Strategic Staff Development , OUP/SRHE, Buckingham 2003 (with Blackmore P)	5923	40	2369
16	"Developing the Subject Dimension of Staff Development" in Blackwell R and Blackmore P (eds) Towards Strategic Staff Development , OUP/SRHE, Buckingham 2003 (with Allan, C and Gibbs, G)	5592	33	1845
	Cumulative Total			60110

Published Conference Papers and Professional Magazine Articles

No	Title and conference	Total words	RJB %	RJB words
17	"In Pursuit of the feel equal factor?" People Management Vol.2 No. 12, June 1996 36-7	1365	100	1365
18	"IT Staff Training in the UK". Contributed Papers: Improving University Teaching , 22 International Conference, July 1997, 455-66	4550	100	4550
19	"The Future of Quality Enhancement". Educational Developments Vol.4 No.3, 10-2 2003	2393	100	2393
	Cumulative Total			68420

The following publications by the author have not been included in the submission:

- A conference paper that formed the basis for subsequent published papers (e.g. McLean and Blackwell 1995)
- Newspaper articles (e.g. two features in THES).
- Papers published only on the internet, for example, two joint seminar papers in the Eastern European series of the Business School at Manchester Metropolitan University and a paper for LTSN (Bryson and Blackwell 2002).
- A contribution to a training resource (Gibbs et al 2000).

APPENDIX 2: Brief summaries of papers submitted
(Chronological by category)

Page

Refereed Journal Articles

61

Book Chapters

80

Published Conference Papers and Magazine Articles

93

Category One: Refereed Journal Articles

1. "Peer Observation of Teaching and Staff Development" Higher Education Quarterly Vol. 50 No. 2 1996: 156-71 (with McLean M)

Main Argument

This paper argues that staff development functions that successfully promote peer observation of teaching (POT) may address 2 main problems: the issue of ownership by academic staff on the one hand, and on the other a strategic engagement especially for those located in personnel offices. The rationale for POT rests on reflective practice and aligning "theories in use" and "espoused theories". A learning cycle is posited following Schon and Kolb on the one hand, and on the other links with research and extending the sense of enquiry and curiosity in teaching. The paper takes Gibbs underpinning principles namely:

- Going with the culture and values and not against them (but the paper says there may be a need to challenge sub cultures, teaching beliefs and practices)
- Building on existing organisational patterns and not cutting across them (the process is based on departments and schools although the potentially negative aspect of reinforcing prejudice and therefore the need for externally generated research and staff development experiences is argued)
- Building on skills that are well used (it identifies feedback to peers but argues that these skills need to be extended for this different context and that a written structure embodying the principles of receiving and giving feedback may be necessary)
- Negotiating and publishing explicit statements of mission and reward that are coherent and mutually supporting (this is seen at the micro level and the paper states "POT schemes should not be directly linked to rewards, as this may distort their developmental purpose (p167) although the paper agrees that it is important to properly reward teaching at the institutional level. Finally then the paper concludes by saying that certainly starting with existing culture, structures and skills are essential but so is moving on if organisational and professional development are to occur under POT...POT has sought to build on existing cultures, structures and skills, but to achieve change the culture needs to be pushed; existing organisational patterns made more porous and flexible and existing skills extended into new and for some staff challenging contexts. Starting with existing culture, structures and skills is essential but so is moving on" (p167).

On **structural location** the paper argues that staff development functions linked with personnel departments may connect with academic culture and achieve at least "some elements" of a focused strategic approach. Four conditions are set to be crucial:

1. Changes within personnel functions away from a central administrative function towards an enabling architect function.
2. That the staff development function itself adopts a partnership model seeking to synthesise different needs from different levels (and that it is provided with sufficient autonomy to do this independently)
3. The ability of the staff developers to gain the trust and respect of both staff and unit heads, involving cultural and political sensitivity and achieving personal credibility

4. Visible and sustained support from the academic leadership. In this connection the paper says simply it is arguing for the possibility of staff development functions linked to personnel may be able successfully to promote initiatives like POT. It calls for greater research on different models, including the educational development model, case studies of apparent success and failure in different contexts and so on to inform the debate about structural locus described as “currently rather partisan” (p169). Thus POT is seen to promote reflective practice and professional development for individuals; exhibit some elements of focussed strategic staff development (and thereby enhance the organisational credibility for staff development functions); and to contribute to departmental and organisational development, helping to promote the learning organisation.

Key Points and Detail

A middle section describes how POT schemes are established and carried out based on developments at the University of Nottingham (six departments are mentioned, three schools and one faculty having introduced the trial schemes under discussion). Evaluation in History and Maths is mentioned and subsequently the department of History is particularly picked out as one in which there appears to be evidence of an emerging appropriate culture with an integrated staff development plan based around POT (p166). Seven benefits are identified for POT. Risks include inappropriate implementing, for example by imposition or complacent backslapping reinforcing existing prejudices and therefore producing counter productive results. This is thought most likely where the combination of clumsy implementation and such prejudice exists. Staff development is seen as a means of tackling it. The paper outlines the need for mutually reinforcing tendencies at national, institutional, departmental and individual level in order to ensure that professional conversations and reflection are not squeezed out. At national level the development of Teaching Quality Assessment is seen as critical. Whilst rewarding openly and transparently good teachers is endorsed the paper comments that “classroom observation for promotional and other judgemental purposes may require a separate system of trained outside observers producing reliable ratings in the context of data on disciplinary/departmental norms and triangulating their observations with other information (for example, student feedback and outcome data)” (p164). Institutional wide staff development is seen as crucial for providing a flow of ideas into departments and discipline, as is initial training courses and the dissemination of research findings on pedagogy providing a language and conceptual framework for staff. The paper comments that “involving those for whom courses are intended in their design facilitation and review through working parties and the like should be an important principle to ensure provision is not imposed from the top and grows from the existing culture” (p165). The paper goes on to comment that institutional staff development functions can also play a role by facilitating departmental initiatives providing resources (including financial resources), consultancy-based services and training for staff development officers in departments.

At departmental level an active strategy involving an integrated staff development plan (seminars, away days, cascading back, study leave and academic leadership are mentioned). Integrated professional development plans are necessary for all (p165). The final paragraph in this section then discusses developments at the University of Nottingham at institutional level –change to promotion procedures, the introduction of

a new teaching committee, the establishment of a Director of Teaching Enhancement and so on, together with developments in the department of History are mentioned as grounds for optimism along with the work of some innovative individuals.

2. "Mentoring New University Teachers" *International Journal for Academic Development* Vol. 1 No 2 1996 80-85 (with McLean M)

Main Argument

This paper focuses on the role of the mentor rather than that of the mentee (as discussed in the first paper on mentoring, a book chapter summarised below). It develops the arguments of the previous paper further. In particular it argues for mutuality and egalitarianism underpinning the peer based role and collaborative learning, whilst restating the case for informality. It says, for example, that many of the roles commonly ascribed to the mentor alone may be equally applied and performed by mentees (p 82).

Two new strands to the argument are concerned with the case for formal intervention where inappropriate attitudes and behaviours are being modelled or, worse still, a conservative department or cynical individual is transmitting their world view to the mentee. It is argued, in response, that sub cultural diversity is a strength of universities and indeed even that counter cultures may be valuable in promoting organisational learning (p83). The paper says that such worries must not be a cloak for tackling particularly unfavoured sub cultures (such as the anarchical one identified by Sawbridge). It expresses scepticism that formal training can counteract such tendencies and sees a case for formal intervention only in the grossest cases of failure, dissatisfaction or manipulation. Much is seen to depend operationally on the head of department and the department's staff development representative. A second area that is picked up more strongly is the whole question of effectiveness. Suggestions are that research into whether mentored individuals move more quickly up the learning curve than unmentored ones is required together with a focus on the different models of mentoring and their differential impact (and whether they change over time). Concluding that "good outcome based research is likely to be required to complement existing qualitative data if mentoring is to flourish in the long run" (p84).

Key Points and Detail

Greater use is made of evidence on extensiveness. The phases of the relationship are considered more carefully, as are the questions that come up in discussions between mentors and their mentees. The then recent overview report from the Higher Education Quality Councils audits is also brought into the discussion.

Evidence Base and Methodology

The paper draws on a wider base of literature than previously including new publications together with new feedback and survey work at the authors' institutions. There is evidence that the previous work on mentoring has affected practice: discussion with heads of departments at the University of Nottingham on the feedback from previous mentor experiences is mentioned as is the publication in 1996 of a new staff development handbook with a section on mentoring to guide departments. At Keele it appears the comments of new staff on the valuing of the mentoring relationship have also been circulated to mentors.

Research questions around effectiveness and the empirical base for supposing that mentor relationships develop through stages in different models are identified as outstanding.

3. "Opportunity Knocks? Professionalism and Excellence in University Teaching". **Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice** Vol. 3 No. 1 1997: 85-99 (with McLean M)

Main Argument

The paper proposes that excellence in teaching resides in a reflective self-critical, theoretically informed approach, characterized by continuous professional conversations with peers. Through this approach teachers develop conceptions of teaching which can contribute to improved practice and to changing thinking about teaching and learning in departments. This reflective pedagogy has the potential for engaging academics in making cultural changes necessary to professionalize and enhance the status of teaching. Teaching Quality Assessment is seen as presenting an opportunity for doing that.

Key Points

The paper argues for a reflective pedagogy in which the teaching portfolio is both a vehicle for and evidence of a cycle of practice reflection and modification upon practice. Feedback on practice is seen as a powerful tool for aligning espoused theories and theories in use. Professional dialogue is advocated as a series of interrogations overcoming isolation and turning anxiety into continual discussion and problem solving. It enables enquiry across disciplinary boundaries and the application of different paradigms. Mutual observation is seen as a stimulus for such discussions and conversations about what constitutes good practice in disciplinary contexts. Pedagogic theory stimulates change by providing a framework for understanding, reduces the dangers of reinforcing common place but ill-founded assumptions about teaching and keeps professional interest alive. It enables critical reflection on the disjunction between common sense, informal theories and actual formal theory derived from research.

Evidence is drawn from the University of Keele and portfolios from its training courses. Three features are identified:

- Making use of mistakes and difficulties to stimulate reflection and 'making good';
- Problem solving and continuous improvement achieved by framing the problems as a site for seeking alternative solutions to teaching problems;
- Developing more sophisticated "espoused theories" and attempting to make them congruent with "theories in use". This involves seeing the teaching process as a learning process itself for the lecturer and for drawing upon disciplinary based literature on examining the teaching process (through for example the work of Dewey, and Booth).

Improvement and change are seen as being linked to conceptual change on the part of teachers in particular, focusing on student learning and accepting there is no best method of doing things.

The paper goes on to argue that the system at Keele is closely linked with departments and therefore they have a wider impact. Mentors and mentoring are one such link (mentors are required to provide reports and in these they tend to comment positively on the impact that the enquiring committed teachers have on them). A number of quotations indicate departments value the input not only from new lecturers but also

from graduate teaching assistants in leading departmental thinking. Also departments are assessors of portfolios, three factors lead to optimism: First, this approach of critical enquiry making teaching more professional is congruent with academic values, secondly demographic change is producing more younger, open minded staff and thirdly the teaching quality assessment process whilst flawed in conception, has created momentum and an opportunity to create debate about what constitutes good practice. The process itself is seen as contradictory and involving a discourse drawn from management and quality assurance, rather than traditional academic discourse which is preferred because of the ability of academics to connect with it more fully. At the institutional level, focus should be on the quality of the environment and in the conclusion it is stated that this approach has the potential to enable expert teachers to emerge as well as discipline experts and thus enable staff to see an expanded professional role. Training is seen as a start to professionalizing teaching and creating a new teaching culture.

Evidence Base and Methodology

Training programme for new teachers at the University of Keele is taken as an example illustrating the approach. 2 years of teaching portfolios (60) provide the sample of which 29 are identified as being good or excellent. 32 portfolios are regarded as adequate or poor. The excellent portfolios discuss higher level matters, are more selective and detailed, show reference to a literature and recognize the importance of departmental and institutional context. They also exemplify the 3 aspects mentioned earlier (making use of mistakes and difficulties, problem solving in continuous improvement, developing more sophisticated espoused theories). These portfolios are triangulated with evidence from student evaluations, records of observation and mentors' reports. The impact of the training can only be indirectly identified, although it is noted that 4 of the 5 poorest portfolios were from teachers who had not attended the programme regularly. The perception of those involved is that the programme is useful, provides practical and theoretical ideas and legitimates reflexivity.

4. "Teaching Circles: a way forward for part-time teachers in HE?" **International Journal for Academic Development** Vol. 6 No.1 June 2001 40-53 (with Channell, J and Williams, J)

Main Argument

'Teaching Circles' (TCs) are peer discussion groups that focus on improving the teaching and learning practice of members of the TC through the process of discussion and other agreed, supplementary processes (e.g. POT or portfolio building). The paper compares the experience of seeking to introduce TCs as a peer support mechanism for various types of PTT in 4 contrasting case study schools in the social sciences and humanities at the University of Nottingham. The main argument of the paper is that peer based TCs are a strategy open to departments for PTTs however the chances of success are heavily context specific. Careful analysis of predisposing conditions- structural, historical and attitudinal - is essential as is tailoring proposals to these. Extant provision of other forms (mentoring, workshops) may pre-dispose participants to question the value added. The TC name may be off putting to UK people. The paper reports informal comments to the effect that it 'sounds like knitting circles'. Stimulating/achieving participant ownership is critical the paper shows. Drawing on Kelly (1995), it is argued that the central processes are around attribution, identity and leadership (the 'framing' of the initiative- its origins and value- and competent organisation). The paper asserts that the concept of ownership has wider value for change programmes or for those uncomfortable with it, a point of departure that highlights power interests for those engaging in evaluative research.

Key Points

There is a brief literature review on PTTs increased significance in the UK and elsewhere, especially in research intensive universities, and the need for enhanced support strategies. The roots of the TC concept in discussion groups in the USA, drawing partly on the quality circle notion from industry, is outlined and set in the context of other peer strategies such as POT and mentoring. In the empirical study, the context of the schools studied is outlined in some detail including structural and discipline level integration, extent of social integration amongst the group, and the extent to which admin support was provided to the TCs. The experiment is judged to have been an unambiguous success on only one school and a complete failure in one with the other two cases occupying intermediate positions. Analysis of these outcomes enables a discussion of the factors apparently influencing 'success and failure'.

Integration into schools via reporting and influencing mechanisms are discussed and generally thought of as positive. However there is a potential paradox around the sense of being peripheral: as the PTT are drawn more into the mainstream there is an increased risk of TC discussion becoming tied up with programme politics which is a danger with single discipline groups (pp 48-9). The paper argues that compared with Action Learning Sets, one gets more extensive impact but at the expense of the depth of individual professional development (which might more easily be achieved in cross discipline voluntary groupings p 49). One relatively unsuccessful group pointed to the potential value of TC as a mechanism for 'venting' feelings (e.g. about FT academic staff) and passing on grievances (e.g. about allocation of teaching).

Evidence Base and Methodology

The main research questions driving the study were:

Can TCs provide a successful staff development strategy? If so, how may they be set up and what are the key variables influencing the likelihood of success?

The evidence base is four contrasting case studies of schools at University of Nottingham chosen for their different contexts and pre-existing activity on SD. Interviews (some before and after), observation of meetings, feedback from collective discussion, minutes and notes and evaluations after one year form the main data.

The exercise was undertaken by commissioned researchers and the paper raises the issue of the role of researchers that are engaged however little with the processes they are studying and their impact on those processes. It also comments that the commissioning and sponsoring body within the university stayed outside of the process and its evaluation as a way of mitigating the potential sense of evaluating one's own activity (p48). In this sense it deliberately sought a more 'distant' practitioner-oriented research approach than in typical action research projects.

5. "Changing Higher Education", *The International Journal of Management Education* Vol. 1 No. 3 Summer 2001: 4-14 (with Preece D)

Main Argument

This paper applies the work of management educators to organizational change in higher education with particular reference to the work of academic developers, a notion that includes staff developers and others working on enhancement (e.g. within LTSN). The main argument is that academic developers have failed to reflect a shift from organizational development (OD) paradigms, associated with 'truth, trust, love and collaboration' orientation towards 'contextual – processual' (CP) frameworks and thus have a rather naïve view of and engagement with change programmes.

OD is commonly associated with the work of Kurt Lewin and involves at least three branches, focused on the individual perspective, the group dynamics focus and so called 'open systems'. CP frameworks in contrast are associated particularly with the work of Andrew Pettigrew. These frameworks reject uni-directional and rationalist version of change, emphasizing "continuously unfolding and sometimes dramatic change, the role of visionary leadership, internal politicking, quests for power and the pursuit of career advantage" (p7). Pettigrew is thus concerned with 'the management of meaning and with the processes through which change is legitimised' (p7).

Quoting Pettigrew (1985 p7) the paper says 'the real problem of strategic change is anchoring new concepts of reality, new issues for attention, new ideas for debate and resolution and mobilizing concern, energy and enthusiasm often in additive and evolutionary fashion to ensure these early illegitimate thoughts gain powerful support and eventually result in contextually appropriate action' (Pettigrew 1985: 438). This framework emphasizes contexts – both internal and external, the why of change; content – the what of change and process – the how of change.

The paper examines attempts to address the 'not invented here syndrome' in HE and then subsequently discusses the use of peer based processes especially to address issues of ownership. It then argues that there is a failure to explicitly recognize the highly political change of higher education arising from changes in the external context, particularly growing government interest, the role of senior managers on the one hand in simultaneously protecting their institutions and on the other hand professing ownership of change which has in fact come from other sources; disciplinary rivalries, personal jockeying for position and entrenched collegiality in constitutions. The partnership model of staff development, and the somewhat opaque discussion of 'roles' of staff developers is seen as implicit recognition that there is more to the role than technical competence. Feedback from academics is seen as partly reflecting unreflective use of OD assumptions and methods (although the opposite danger of being accused of being too close to management is also recognized- p11). At the same time the paper states that for a variety of reasons, senior managers are increasingly wishing to see staff development 'focused squarely on organizational goals' although often such signals come only through Story's type 5 change or piecemeal signals ... 'in this context, academic developers have considerable autonomy in framing initiatives and defining processes, providing that they are broadly moving in the right direction' (p11).

A final section draws out the lessons for academic developers in terms of

- The choice of change strategy – OD approaches to change are more likely to succeed where it is non political, ‘power assisted steering’ more likely where it is not, with the prospect of a combination of approaches over time to achieve long term change. Halford and Savage suggest that organizational change is often tied up with redefining the personal qualities required of organizational members is also noted (p11).
- Three points are underlined:
 - The need to recognize explicitly the shift from OD to CP approaches in conceptualizing change
 - The need to recognize and accept the fault lines of higher education and to operate politically
 - ‘A need for new or greatly extended forms of development for themselves and their potential future colleagues which incorporate informal learning processes’ (p12).

In conclusion the paper argues that there is more to do, in particular a literature outside of higher education that needs to be incorporated. Second, there is a need to move beyond the relatively small scale focus of much HE enhancement work ‘action research’ and its “particularistic literature unconnected to wider debates’ towards ‘theoretically informed empirical studies of the impact of large scale initiatives such as the LTSN in order to advance our understanding of the relative effectiveness of different approaches to change and to inform the practice of change agents on the ground’ (p12).

Key points and connections

The subject of the paper connects strongly with and to some extent underpins other work. The section on OD highlights the work of French and Bell representing the group dynamics school focusing upon teams and work groups as the way of achieving organizational change. Clearly some of my early work on peer group learning connects with this approach. In unpacking its definition by French and Bell of OD it is notable that one point relates to the deployment of action research as a favoured methodology.

- OD is no quick fix
- OD should be led and supported by top management
- OD involves the creation of an image of a desired organization
- OD involves employee empowerment and incorporates the learning organization linking employee growth and development with organizational success and collective aspiration. It implies employees are active problem solvers and diagnosticians.
- It implies collaborative management of organizational culture and a focus on team working and team configurations.
- It utilizes the consultant – facilitator role
- It draws particularly on applied behavioural science (psychology and social psychology)
- Deploys action research ‘a participative and collaborative model in which leaders, organizational members and OD practitioners work together to resolve problems and grasp opportunities (French and Bell 1995:32).

The connection with the early peer learning work is strong in the paper. An explicit connection is made with the peer based work focusing on the processual dimension of CP frameworks and especially the use of Kelly (1998) to identify social processes connected with generating ownership, (an approach developed in the TC paper).

A further connection is the discussion of CP frameworks and the unfolding apparently piecemeal impulses that come together to form major initiatives, which might be seen as characteristic of the emergence of NM in both the civil service and HE, discussion of which is central to a main chapter of this submission.

At the same time, all papers from POT onwards differentiate themselves from OD in the recognition of contending (and implicitly potentially conflicting) interests denoted by the 'top down and bottom up' analogy and the need for the SD function to handle these. As this paper makes explicit, this implies a 'liberal pluralist' or even 'radical pluralist' frame of reference that recognize conflicting interests as structured into social life either replacing or existing alongside the unitary frame of reference of OD.

A third connection of significance is that with the need to professionalise the leadership function in staff development and how that might be progressed. The concluding part of this paper (pp 11-13) deals with this in some detail, in the context of the need to shift away from reliance on OD, a theme subsequently picked up in 'Rethinking' and 'Strategic Leadership' papers. In this way the paper both provides a conceptual framework for understanding early work on change and a point of departure for subsequent scholarship.

Evidence Base and Methodology

The paper essentially consists of a literature review of the work on organizational change outside of HE linked with and applied to my preceding empirical work on change in HE.

6. "Design of an Industrial Management Course: Bringing together Engineering and Educational Approaches" *European Journal of Engineering Education* Vol. 27 No. 1 2002: 113-129 (with Ratchev, S, and Bonney, M).

Main Argument.

This paper considers the establishment of an industrial management course at the Technical University of Sofia in Bulgaria to meet the demands of new market economy in a changing political and educational environment. Achievements included development of a new curriculum, modularization, introduction of a new teaching quality assurance system and accreditation by the Institution of Electrical Engineers. The process of change is shown to require great sensitivity to the context and deployment of influencing strategies and skills designed to establish and maintain good relationships with a fluctuating caste of characters, including ministers for HE. The role of SD in this process was in relation to (1) influencing strategies, to win over 'the hearts and the minds' of the staff involved including senior staff, (2) to undertake some traditional training type activities (3) to establish processes and procedures that would embed SD and enhancement within the Bulgarian system, notably cascade seminars in Sofia and POT (4) contribute to curriculum development.

The paper argues that the soft systems approach adopted, combined with selective utilization of educational literature, was appropriate to the task. The process of change is shown to require great flexibility to changing stakeholder needs and changes of key personnel as much as or even more than expertise in curriculum development. For example, Bulgarian academic staff were at that time paid for the hours that they taught and therefore any change that reduced hours for individuals, which often translated into modules since each module typically was owned by one person, would be fiercely contested. The proposals implied new modules within a requirement to reduce, not increase, student hours. So we made provision for a stream with 'elective' modules to ensure that all existing Bulgarian staff had potential to input under the new course.

The paper argues that change is facilitated by the development of a subject specific approach. It takes on board the educational literature on deep and surface learning, whilst at the same time questioning whether the 'approaches to learning' or styles of learning approaches articulates culturally specific traits or not. It suggests that a problematic element in the curriculum change process, and in the staff development relating to it, was the failure to address specifically underlying educational values, potentially raising a doubt as to whether the procedures and processes designed to ensure ongoing enhancement had really become embedded within the course culture.

Detail and Key Points.

The paper argues that the developments took place within 5 key contextual influences: First, the assessment of previous European projects, second, the emerging skill requirements within a global economy; third, the legacy system derived from the long period of communist rule; fourth, the adoption of a soft systems methodology, designed 'to connect with the mindset of engineers', and fifth, the educational literature, in particular, drawing on Biggs four principal factors in course design. These factors are:

- An appropriate motivational context
- High learner autonomy

- Interaction with others both peers and teachers
- A well structured knowledge base

The curriculum development is explained and four diagrams represent the overall system (p118), the course structure, including its themes and modules (p 121, 122 and 124).

Infrastructure development involved four related points: organizational restructuring within the faculty, staff development, staff appraisal, and student participation. The discussion section (p125-128) emphasizes influencing and political behaviour designed to achieve change, including by connecting with national actors in order to achieve accreditation within the system (which required legal change) and continuing support for the process, as well as more micro level delivery within the faculty. It raises the question as to whether the processes designed to support deep learning and staff development had really been embedded and secondly how far discussion of learning is based upon culturally specific traits. The conclusion claims a positive balance sheet compared to the record of initial tempus projects.

Evidence Base and Methodology

The paper is essentially a case study of curriculum change in a faculty, university and national system context.

7. "Promoting Quality Enhancement in the UK: The Experience of Collaboration between National Agencies", **Tertiary Education and Management** vol. 11 55-79 2005 (With Gosling, D, D'Andrea, V)

Main Argument/Overview

This paper opens with an outline of quality enhancement as a concept and goes on to describe the quality enhancement scene in the UK prior to the creation of the HE Academy. It argues that the HE Academy has been set up to replace an overcrowded national system and is based upon sound collaborations begun by the pre-existing institutions. It discusses in a little detail an example of this pre existing collaboration, between the Learning and Teaching Support Network (LTSN) and the National Co-ordination Team (NCT). The main contention is that whilst governments continue to rely on competition as the main driver of change in education, the lack of a market for enhancement products has encouraged governments to turn to collaboration to achieve its objectives.

The case study outlines six steps in achieving collaboration between LTSN and NCT. A concluding section discusses how collaboration may be achieved. It argues that change management approaches are necessary, identifying the need to attend to context, content and process based on Blackwell and Preece (2001). It points to the resilience of disciplinary and departmental cultures and the need for outcomes to be defined in terms of the way they best serve both planners and those on the ground, seeing the change impulse as constructed and reconstructed incrementally by those involved (p 20). The paper suggests that collaboration depends on a number of factors and organizational culture:

1. *A shared vision* spread throughout the organization in which those involved participated in its design, creation or development so that they experience ownership.
2. *Task orientation*: that the achievement of the task is more important than defending the existing organizational structure.
3. *Openness and sensitivity* enabling easy sharing of people, tasks, resources and ideas between the organizations concerned.
4. *Pragmatism and flexibility* willingness and ability to respond to circumstances is essential.

It goes on to note that policy initiatives are invariably interpreted through local contexts and given meanings in those contexts, implying that this needs to be appreciated in the change management process. Finally, it notes importance of power relations drawing on Lewin (1952) and his field force theory. In this context HEFCE is seen as 'critical' (p 21) in shifting the equilibrium. There is then a discussion about the difficulties of collaborating where one organization feels powerless or has a weaker independent powerbase noting that as agencies of the funding councils the examples quoted had an advantage in this respect. It further notes that the academy should be in a more powerful position but at the same time this will encourage greater official interest and engagement in 'top down mandates' arguing that for the Higher Education Academy 'managing this potential tension between top down mandates and the need for an independent powerbase that enables faculty to articulate their agendas upwards and outwards will be a major challenge. Protecting a creative space for individuals and groups to experiment in learning and teaching will be a key task in this broader challenge if enhancement is to be sustained' (p 22).

A conclusion summarizes the argument, noting the intersection between quality enhancement and collaboration; the overcrowded landscape and dependence on governments financial support; the grounds for optimism given by the case study and the need for culturally sensitive change management that takes into account cultural factors and power resources in context. For collaboration to succeed it summarizes: a shared vision, a task orientation, openness and sensitivity, pragmatism and flexibility and then seems to add based on the case study, that successful collaboration requires that 'the barriers to the collaboration are known, acknowledged and addressed' (p 23). It concludes 'that the collaborative foundation that has been laid provides hope that the HE Academy will get off to a good start in achieving its quality enhancement objectives' (p 24).

Detail and Key Points

The landscape of quality enhancement is described briefly around the TQEF, at subject level (LTSN and FDTL); at institutional level (around learning and teaching strategies) and at individual level around the national teaching fellowship scheme.

The paper notes the compliance culture that quality assurance unlinked to quality enhancement tends to create, dampening creativity and rewarding conformity. It argues that assurance should be brought together with educational development utilizing a model developed by Gosling and D'Andrea. The paper asserts a number of issues and questions: that potential conflict between efficiency and pedagogical goals has not been fully explored; that attention to enhancement in learning and teaching is seen as a counterweight to emphasis on research; and that the underlying quality enhancement agenda is linked to the attainment of political goals.

8. "Managing Temporary Workers in Higher Education – Still at the Margin?"
Personnel Review Vol.35 No.2 2006: 207-224 (with Bryson, C)

Main argument

The paper is an empirical study based on five case study institutions. The findings indicate a continuum of strategic choice from integration at one pole, to differentiation at the other. In all cases strategy appeared in practice to be a tendency or predominant direction of travel. Integrationist approaches consist of treating full time staff and PTT as near as possible alike (pro-rata), offering them opportunities to be integrated into the organization, aiming for reciprocal commitment and a 'relational' employment relationship. Differentiators in contrast sought clear blue water between PTT and full time staff, were most seized of the need to reduce organizational 'risk' derived from local failure associated with PTT and aimed at (or at least were content with) a 'transactional' employment relationship. In practice, both strategies were compromised by the demands of a heterogeneous workforce and the needs of local heads. Discussion by the authors suggests that the integrationist strategy is generally more likely to achieve a blend of organizational goals, departmental heads needs and the desires of (most) PTT themselves in the long run although even this is not without caveat.

Key points and detail

The paper introduces debates about numerical flexibility, temporary and part-time employment in the UK from organizational behaviour/HRM into analysis of institutional strategy towards engagement of PTTs. It notes the generally large proportion of part-time professional workers both in the economy as a whole and in higher education particularly. The paper proceeds by discussing HRM in UK higher education noting the work of critics and the apparent improvements in the area of SD. The growth of part-time teachers is ascribed to a combination of factors including a lack of regulation, structural weakness in 'owning' HR issues; the ability of local heads to respond to rapidly changing market needs through employing part-time teachers and so on with countervailing pressures including European legislation, risks to quality and trade union campaigns against casualisation.

A section on justifications for strategic approaches reports the views of senior managers. A further section deals with the alignment of part-time strategies with other imperatives and here notes that in two cases the organization was undertaking a major re-profiling of its academic staff. Where the priorities of this clashed with part-time teacher policy it was the latter that suffered. A discussion session introduces the notion of strategic choice, single and dual HR strategies and risk management (especially in relation to quality and institutional reputation).

The discussion is sceptical that the differentiators will achieve the distance from academic staff that they think they will (and therefore whether legal risk is being fully managed). It further argues that in any case they have failed fully to take into account the needs and views of their academic heads and thus there is a risk that these heads will undermine the strategy at local level. Scepticism is also expressed about the cost argument, namely that the integrationist strategy is 'too expensive', since intangible costs to do with maintaining morale and transactional costs (to do with frequent recruitment and selection exercises locally) are often not included in the calculation of the costs of differentiation approaches. The expressed flexibility needs of heads for

substitute teachers with a wide task range also conflicted with the differentiation strategy, in which the task range was deliberately narrowed to reduce risk exposure (for example, by excluding marking duties). The question of commitment in the psychological contract is discussed at some length drawing on 'a recurring theme' in the literary on temporary and precarious workers. Discussion then turns to the ambiguities and compromises that both differentiators and integrators experience in practice.

In both strategic camps there were heads and/or groups of PTT who sought greater commitment from their organization than differentiation implied and, conversely, groups of professionals (e.g. in art and design, musical instrument tuition) who did not want to be fully integrated, trained or placed under contractual obligation to do things beyond their teaching sessions. Some of these were prestigious performers with considerable personal bargaining power too. Also, the integrationists were placing themselves at most risk in relation to failures of quality. Whilst there was a commitment to extending training and development, including to accredited programmes in one instance, the paper suggests that adequate training and preparation will be a challenging task to achieve in practice. The paper implies that on balance movement towards integrationist strategies, despite some ambiguities and compromises in practice, seems to offer better prospects of long run organizational gain and staff job satisfaction, although it does not regard either approach as fully satisfactory.

Methodology

The paper is an empirical study based on five case study institutions, selected 'purposively' because they were thought to be proactive on the issue. In addition, they were selected to represent a reasonable cross section of institutional types and to include HEIs known to make heavy use of part-time teachers. The main data sources were interviews with strategy makers at institutional level and heads of department with operational responsibilities in some selected departments and desk research, including scrutiny of relevant documents provided by the case study organizations. The voice of PTT themselves was drawn from other literature, including previous work by the authors.

9. "Strategic Leadership in Academic Development", *Studies in Higher Education*, 2006 Vol. 33 No.3: 373-82 (with Blackmore, P)

Main Argument and Development of the Paper

Initially the paper reviews the changing nature of the academic role, and attempts at professionalizing academic work 'in the sense of defining required expertise, providing development opportunities and formally recognizing proficiency' (p 374) promoted by government. The Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education is identified as an example of a 'top down' initiating impulse combined with 'bottom up' development of control through individual membership and representative structures. The potential tension between establishing minimum standards (a common goal in professionalism) designed to protect the interests of client groups and the notion of autonomy in academic life is identified. The allegiance of academic staff both to external professional bodies in some areas and the less formal notion of 'being professional' is also seen as a barrier to formal professionalizing strategy.

The paper advocates an explicit concern with the whole faculty role identifying it as 'including teaching, research, knowledge transfer and civic engagement, leadership, management and administration, and with their interrelationships' (p 375) arguing that this is even more important with the current trends towards fragmentation. It introduces the idea of variation over a career in task range as a response to unrealistic requirements for continuous excellence on all fronts. This also avoids the 'unbundling' of the academic role but provides scope for recognizing the inevitable need for a degree of specialization at particular points. It concludes 'threshold standards of competence or proficiency may need to be contemplated in each area' (p 376). It advocates a parallel professionalisation strategy for leaders of academic development as a way of maintaining and enhancing both the confidence of their academic colleagues in their activities and their own capacity and competence.

Leadership in Academic Development

Two sections then identify the leadership role in academic development. The mediating role between different interests and the potential tension between strategic SD focused on organizational needs and the preferred ways of working of individuals are identified together with the inevitable questioning of credentials that accredited programmes bring. A picture of staff development heads is then painted based on a sample of 18 (about a fifth in post) - the 'proficient head'. This focuses on the following:

- The ability to be analytical
- Political awareness
- Good personal contacts coming from duration in the organization
- The ability to shift between frames of reference
- Fragmentation and decision making
- Awareness and use for a range of techniques
- Project management skills
- Clear goals
- Ability to work at national level

A review of learning patterns and activities indicates a preference for informal social, tacit learning and relatively limited engagement with formal education. A similar

picture emerges from a review of Australasian faculty development heads (although half of that sample of 25 had begun working life as school teachers). The paper asks 'put bluntly, how credible are heads or their staff in the formal preparation of faculty, if they themselves, have taken no part in formal learning?' (p 378).

Various initiatives and/or potential routes for achieving this are reviewed including the SEDA fellowship scheme, the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development standards framework, the ILTHE and, Higher Education Research Development Society of Australasia's fellowship 'recognition and development scheme'. None are judged to be wholly satisfactory.

Leadership and Academic Development

This section outlines the qualities and foci required of leaders if they are to parallel and interact productively with a holistic conception of the faculty role. It asks the question 'what might a leadership role in the development of academic practice look like'? The first part of this section argues for the need to adopt a holistic conception of the academic role and move away from the default position in which academic development is associated 'wholly or mainly' with teaching and learning. It notes the variability of faculty roles changes over the course of careers and argues that academic development leaders need to be offered and take up similar combinations of experience to their faculty colleagues. Important claims can be made to assisting with 'double' and 'triple' loop organizational learning and promoting evidence-based practice as part of a professionalizing strategy. In terms of the known orientations of SD personnel this implies a shift towards system and policy orientations but not to the extent of simple compliant managerialism as the ability and willingness to question and critique remains important to learning.

The paper concludes by explicitly stating that it sees the faculty role and the academic development (or SD) role being professionalized in parallel. It argues that the qualities identified for the head of academic development start to outline what 'heads could be expected to possess, at least at a threshold level' (p 384). It sees the need to combine informal learning, more formal development embedded possibly in work-based learning qualifications probably at Masters Level.

Evidence Base and Methodology

The paper is based upon a combination of literature review, previous work by the authors (including with other collaborators) and an empirical study of leaders of academic development in the UK.

Category Two: Book Chapters

10. "New Managerialism in the Civil Service: Industrial Relations under the Thatcher Administrations 1979-86 in Mailly R, Sethi and Dimmock, S. (1989) **Industrial Relations in the Public Services**. London: Routledge: 68-113 (With Lloyd, P)

Main Argument

This book chapter argues that "the Thatcher years do mark a significant turning point denoted by the emergence of new managerialism; a coherent strategy for management which is intended to integrate and institutionalise key policy initiatives and operational priorities" (p 69). The main conceptual framework draws on the work of Anthony Ferner who postulates a continuum of state influence (the political contingency) "at one extreme the state merely provides the rules within which private enterprise operates. At the other, the goals, objectives and rules of operation of some enterprises may be almost entirely determined by the state" (Ferner 1985: 48) quoted on p 104. It is argued that the Civil Service falls at this latter end of the continuum and that changes in the historical context, in particular the breakdown of the post war political consensus and, in the 1970s, post war economic prosperity stimulated much greater political intervention in the running of the civil service by Governments driven by the necessities of maintaining incomes policies and achieving reductions in public expenditure and staff numbers.

The civil service case is seen as special in the sense (1) of being under much more direct political control in principle. (2) That the civil service to some extent formed a laboratory for testing and development of specific government policies in relation to reducing resources, cutting staff numbers, promoting efficiency and decentralised management. (3) That the civil service was seen by the incoming Thatcher administration as a political adversary *per se*, an organisation dominated by consensus politics and hidden agendas similar to those seen in the popular television programme "Yes Minister". (4) The incoming Thatcher regime viewed the civil service as uniquely privileged and in relation to its employment in need of "deprivileging". Finally, it is contended that a range of policies, initially introduced in a rather piecemeal way, produced a 'new managerialism' (which chapter 3 of this submission argued formed the basis for the 'new public management' and some of the trends experienced more recently in HE). This paper sees new managerialism as a strategy that "involves a simultaneous centralisation of certain types of decisions and a decentralisation of operational decisions to line managers. Thus ministerial control over key processes of policy making and strategic departmental management has been tightened, while at the same time line manager discretion to manage resources has been increased although often within stringent budgetary constraints. Management information systems and central monitoring devices have been developed apace, ministerial accountability has been stressed and a range of measures taken to encourage and reward the resource efficient manager. This approach, is an attempt to create "a new managerialism" in the civil service: that is a management able to deploy optimally declining resource inputs within constraints acting as proxies for market forces" (p75).

Key Points

The article proceeds by examining the development of new managerialism. Piecemeal initiatives, particularly the financial management initiative, a review of

personnel work, and greater flexibility of pay bargaining are seen as key aspects. Developments in pension arrangements and pay bargaining (p76-86) designed to weaken if not remove pay comparability and replace it by greater flexibility are discussed; the development of new managerialism (pp 86-95) in which specific initiatives on man power economies and cuts in staff numbers, efficiency initiatives and the financial management initiative itself are discussed within this section; and the development of trade unions since 1979 (pp 95-104).

The conclusion notes that “normative consensus between the principle negotiators has diminished and ideological conflict becomes more common at all levels. Thus, in contrast to the past high levels of trust and strong bargaining relationships have become difficult to establish and maintain” (p107). The continuation of new managerialism into the future (the chapter was published in 1989) is thought likely to be affected by the extent to which the treasury is prepared to adopt a hands-off approach to decentralised budgets and not simply to see them as an opportunity for continuous resource cutting although it is argued, the trends are sufficiently well established that differentiation between policy advisers and managers and layers of more peripheral staff is seen as likely (p108). The paper concludes “whether this emergent system, which is based upon no explicitly articulated or agreed assumptions about the relationship between government and its employees, can ensure the type of stability characteristic of the traditional system for the bulk of its existence remains highly questionable” (p108).

Evidence Base and Methodology

The notes make clear that this chapter is based on an ESRC research project. Over 150 interviews were conducted with senior national players on the ‘official’ and trade union sides, in a sample of selected civil service departments designed to be representative of the whole civil service. A large amount of documentary evidence in the form of management and union records’ both public and private’ was examined and a number of project papers produced (see Lloyd and Blackwell 1995). It was in short a large scale empirical and predominantly qualitative research project.

11. "Work Based Assessment: the Graduate Diploma in Employment Relations" in Brown, G and Pendlebury, M (1992) **Assessing Active Learning, Module 11, part II**. Sheffield: CVCP Universities Staff Development and Training Unit pp 83-5

Main Argument

This case study concerns a course established in 1998 with professional status from the Institute of Personnel Management (now the Chartered Institute of Management and Development). The final term of this postgraduate course was given over to a project based placement which carried 40% of the overall course mark, the focus of the piece.

The main aims of this were: to encourage the integration of knowledge learnt in separate modules; to require students to contextualize their learning 'in work and practice'; to encourage critical reflection on, and analysis of, work experience; and to facilitate further skills development. The assessment scheme for the project based placement included 30% on a written report (double marks); 10% on an oral presentation to the student group and staff and a 'learning log' marked at threshold pass/fail.

The paper emphasizes the desire to ensure some independence from placement organizations in order to avoid 'unreflective description of work experience' and although this is largely judged to have been a success it did create some mismatch of expectations between (usually smaller) organizations and students. A recommendation for dealing with this is learning contracts (p84). Second the learning log, whilst useful as a monitoring device particularly where there were some disputes, is largely judged to have been a failure as a self assessment method since it was not supported or given weight in the assessment scheme. The article asserts that 'the whole of the assessment process cried out for greater student involvement. Both the learning log and oral presentations would be obvious candidates for self and peer assessment" (p84).

The paper concludes by pointing to a dilemma in relation to work organizations involvement in assessment. Although this might help with access and relevance, it might also undermine student independence, arguably a critical factor in ensuring projects did not simply become uncritical 'reports to management'.

12. "Formal Pupil or Informal Peer?" in Fullerton H. (ed.) (1996) **Facets of Mentoring in Higher Education**. Birmingham: SEDA Paper 94 23-31 (with McLean, M)

Main Argument

This paper notes the emerging interest in mentorships as a form of development in higher education and seeks to challenge the orthodox preference for formal, hierarchical schemes of written rules, training, active selection and monitoring. It argues for the benefits of informality and peer based schemes, in which learning is collaborative and two way (rather than hierarchical and one way). It presents a four fold classification of mentoring schemes along two axes, pupil and peer on the horizontal plane and formal and informal on the vertical plane.

The case for informality rests largely on the preferences revealed by those engaged in mentorships on the one hand and, on the other, evidence of the existence of considerable informal mentorships which work well and may be damaged by the imposition of formal schemes. It recognises the case for greater formality where mentorships are ineffective but argues that other options exist, such as handling the matter informally through the departments concerned. It also identifies the need to build in feedback loops to enable this to happen and to mitigate the lack of evaluative evidence on effectiveness.

The case for a peer focus is made largely in terms of its fit with academic culture and values and in particular sub cultures. There is a discussion of variation in departmental sub cultures based on faculty or discipline grouping both in principle and latterly examples are presented from the University of Nottingham in relation to the four fold model presented. The notion of peer is taken from the Oxford Dictionary and is discussed in relation to status, age and assumptions about knowledge. A brief paragraph about knowledge argues for a collaborative view of learning which treats it as 'a social, non competitive autonomous process that generates its own source of authority for knowledge (i.e. it is not given by the instructor/teacher). In this view, learning may involve assimilation into communities of knowledgeable peers as much as learning about "things"'.

The paper concludes that "it seems both desirable and pragmatically sensible to go with the culture and values, wherever that is possible, rather than to cut across them . . . informal peer mentoring based on the traditions of peer review and collaborative learning has potential to be another such process. Although the research and evaluation base for prescriptive statement appears to be weak, it appears to be necessary to combine formal and informal features, laying down a minimal framework of flexible rules. For staff developers, a practical desire to get things moving must be tempered by a little caution. Whilst the apparently time efficient and cost effective nature of mentoring are attractive selling points, these advantages can be lost if inappropriate models are pushed through in over formal schemes. Apparently valued relationships and arrangements often exist locally and can easily be damaged in the desire to provide an inclusive, quality assured system. The challenge is to encourage such informal relationships while at the same time providing a formal safety net for those unable to develop them" (pp 30-31).

Evidence Base and Methodology

The paper proceeds by “drawing on the literature and relating it to evidence and experience from our own institutions” (p 24). In the case of the University of Nottingham this involves feedback on a consultation exercise on mentoring; feedback from new teachers undergoing training; feedback from those undergoing mentor and mentee training and finally evidence from a questionnaire survey of all academic and academic related staff in 1995 (34.3 response). In the case of the University of Keele the evidence base is the portfolios submitted by new staff which include comment on the mentor scheme and second the reports provided by mentors on the progress of their mentees. This evidence is quoted, both in the form of numerical data and quotations from questionnaire responses and portfolios, quite extensively to establish the preference for informality and the circumstances which mentees call for greater formality (i.e. ineffective mentoring). These sources are also used in discussion of peer learning to challenge the view that mentees are dependent on their mentors, especially quotations from the portfolios at Keele about the leading role that some new staff are playing in relation to teaching. The paper suggests further research is needed on effectiveness.

13. "Rethinking Strategic Staff Development" in Blackwell R and Blackmore P (eds) (2003) **Towards Strategic Staff Development in Higher Education**. Buckingham: SRHE/OUP: 3-15 (with Blackmore, P)

Main Argument

The paper focuses on the impact of SD on organisational strategy and effectiveness. It challenges the tendency of the SD community to, on the one hand, bemoan their lack of strategic influence within institutions and, on the other hand, to condemn (selectively) 'managerialism'. The chapter shows that an organisationally-engaged staff development function can contribute to organisational effectiveness in a number of different ways and at different levels. It offers thoughts for those in staff development functions about how they may maintain some independence, adopt some organisationally critical stances (such as 'deviant innovation' and 'tempered radicalism') that do not imply simple conformity and may, from an organisational and senior management point of view, help to stimulate double and triple loop learning, especially helpful in times of radical organisational change and/or survival crises.

Key Points

The paper reviews, firstly, strategic human resource development and its nine characteristics noting the UK literature focusing on both top down and bottom up impulses. The paper says "it is likely that staff developers would need to deliver on their general mandate and key central policies before a role in policy formation would be enabled. In other words, to move along the continuum of influence, staff developers first need to demonstrate their value to the organisation at a lower strategic level" (p 6). The increasing importance of employment relations, career progression and rewards are identified such that HRM must be an important internal partner in change despite misgivings in the staff development community. Also, the strategic significance of the 'environment scanning' function is identified and underlined.

Scholarship on organisational learning and in particular notions of single, double and triple loop learning is introduced. Duke's (2002) work on the ideal seeking university - the management of the learning organisation - and James's inquiry-based approach to structured serendipity are discussed. The next section deals with communities of practice and social practice approaches focusing upon informal, tacit learning arising from everyday practice. Although noting that such communities may be the bearers of dysfunctional local traditions and prejudices, not to mention rather exclusive, the paper argues for a positive role for staff developers in providing consultancy support and tools locally. Second, a strategic role in enabling double loop learning by bringing together communities and working horizontally across them to encourage sharing and exchange of learning is identified.

The next section deals with structures. Locations are largely seen to be based on local historical, policy preference and political power play factors. Even those in apparently less favoured positions for connecting to academic cultures and influencing strategy, noticeably attachment to HRM and located in education departments may be able to function perfectly successfully in propitious conditions. The fear of infection from 'personnel' that pervades parts of SD community is questioned. In Gosling's (2001) study only 17% were attached to HRM. Reporting lines showed much more consistency; 51% reporting to Pro-Vice Chancellors or Vice Chancellors and a further 8% to Registrars. Although this might be encouraging from

a strategic point of view, and is often seen as unproblematic by staff developers themselves, it could be interpreted as greater integration into managerialism than location within HRM typically a lower status position than that of PVC.

A section on professionalism discusses the formation of the international consortium for educational development and the development of a fellowship scheme by the Staff and Educational Development Association. It notes the attempts of some pre-1992 Universities in the UK to combine enquiry into their own educational practice, that is to say research that would count in the RAE, with practical academic staff development. The lack of a clear career path and diametrically opposing views about professionalism in Australia are mentioned, together with the lack of formal preparation for or experience of senior management roles. It sees some important issues of standards, preparation and training underlying the issues of capacity and capability. Changes in Europe, and in the UK specifically, may yet bring into focus the credentials of those who purport to undertake the development of, for example, accredited teachers.

The approach to strategy raises the question of whether ethical stances can thrive in organisationally aligned functions and whether critical stances can make contributions to organisational effectiveness. The paper discusses the deviant innovator role, derived from the work of Karen Legg (1978) noting it is a role that accords with the notions of double loop learning, but is probably only available to the Heads of Staff Development functions and in boom conditions. It is also based on a notion of independent professional practice and protection. An even more challenging stance is 'Tempered Radicalism', a 'dualist strategy of ambivalence'. According to Meyerson and Scully (1995) "Tempered Radicals are individuals who identify with and are committed to their organisations and are also committed to a cause, community or ideology that is fundamentally different from and possibly at odds with the dominant culture of their organisation". Such a stance may benefit the organisation at times of step change or in particular policy areas because tempered radicals are more easily able to engage in triple loop learning and 'think outside the box'. Also they may be a powerful defence against untempered critique. This stance is most likely to flourish in relaxed institutional funding regime, when the function has independent access to external project funding, or as a minor part of a more organisationally focused activity (p13), the paper suggests. For those engaged in change, particularly top down change, it is argued that a situational ethic is implied. Drawing on the work of Buchanan and Badham (1999) and Hicks (1998) in a HE staff development context (p13), the paper concludes that "the balance of input needs to continue to shift from emphasis on individual academic members of staff towards greater organisational alignment at both the institutional and departmental level" (p14) But, it goes on to note that even this conclusion is not as clear as it might seem since the subject dimension needs to be included and, as the learning works initiative at the University of Glasgow has shown, organisational benefit can be derived from programmes based on the wants of individuals. Thus "the analytical distinction between individually focused and organisationally focused development is in practice blurred and the relative gain from learning is often shared in somewhat unpredictable proportions" (p14).

Evidence Base and Methodology

This chapter falls within traditional British notions of "scholarship" that have prevailed in the humanities and parts of the social sciences. It brings to bear a large

literature and body of evidence, some of it based on detailed empirical studies, and advances a particular position. It acknowledges ambiguity and contradiction and indeed even the problematic nature of the notion of a greater organisational focus that it advocates.

The central research questions addressed are (1) can staff development make a contribution to organisational development and effectiveness? (2) How does the staff development community need to change in order to make contributions to organisational development and effectiveness?

14. "Developing Departments" in Blackwell R and Blackmore P (eds) (2003) **Towards Strategic Staff Development in Higher Education**. Buckingham: SRHE/OUP

Main Argument

This paper argues that the department is the main activity system for staff and that departmental cultures have a strong influence over staff thinking such that they are more likely to respond positively to messages from their culture than those from external courses and development. There are also doubts over the transferability of external training into internal practice, notwithstanding evidence from Rust (1998) that enthusiastic volunteers on teaching courses who say they will make changes to practice do appear to do so; and the role external courses may play in maintaining motivation and morale. The importance of tacit, informal, social learning, distributed across the department is asserted and 'bricolage or tinkering' identified as a legitimate approach to change where a healthy community of practice already exists. This puts a special emphasis on creating opportunities for reflection and learning in normal meetings, local leaders supporting innovators and modelling 'good practice' and so on. Three roles are seen as central: the Head of Department, or leader of the community of practice; the local staff development representative and the staff development unit. A fourfold classification of the roles of staff development representative in the department are presented along 2 axes (high/low capability and reactive/proactive axes) and up to ten potential activities identified.

The paper suggests that the departmental level is of increasing interest because of changing context within HEIs, notably trends towards devolution, the influence of disciplines, departmental mergers and associated needs for development. This suggests a greater focus on the strategic needs of departments, the provision of brokerage and consultancy services and an increase of capacity within staff development units themselves. The chapter therefore makes a case for staff development units to engage much more actively with the needs of their departments, on the one hand, and on the other, for an important role for staff development units in fulfilling departmental and organisational needs

Structures

Based on the work of Hicks (1999) the central unit may operate along two separate dimensions producing four models: along a local-central axis and a generic-discipline specific dimension. Hicks identifies central models: dispersed models (involving devolution of resources sometimes establishing a purchaser-provider relationship between departments and SD units); mixed models in which a number of different forms of initiative co-exist in a largely unrelated way and, finally, an integrated model which takes a holistic approach. The latter appears rare. The paper suggests that largely unrelated coexisting activity is more common than integration. The 'buying out' of some time from practising academic staff as at Nottingham Trent University is noted, as is the interesting example at Oxford Brookes, whereby the aggregate person days available to the unit were calculated, a top slice taken for corporate activities and the rest allocated pro rata to departments as free consultancy days. Finally, the article argues that in a mature learning culture, the case for a central unit may be less strong from a narrow, departmental perspective, although as a provider of corporate, strategically-focused staff development and in the roles of coordination and knowledge sharing across departments, it remains significant. It notes that "without a

central unit of strategic focus would be difficult to achieve. Difficult to achieve but not impossible: witness the case of the University of the West of England, a well regarded UK institution. Extant staff development units would be wise to ensure that as well as provision seen as directly relevant to organisational goals by institutional leaders, they provide demonstrably good and valued services to their departments” (p128).

Evidence Base and Methodology

The article combines literature review with experiential evidence and action research. It reviews the literature on communities of practice, transfer environments and the work of Hicks on role of staff development units. The discussion of the roles of the Head of Department, staff development representative (and the model presented) and to a lesser extent the role of the staff development unit are experiential and based on action research by the author.

15. "Academic Roles and Relationships" in Blackwell R and Blackmore P (eds) (2003) **Towards Strategic Staff Development in Higher Education**. Buckingham: SRHE/OUP

Main Argument

The main argument of this chapter is that there is a need to establish an inclusive academic profession. The chapter argues that based on various empirical studies in Australia, UK and USA traditional roles have been eroded, contract and part-time employment grown and levels of satisfaction and stress changed accordingly. Boundaries between academic staff and other staff have been eroded (professional administrators, staff and information services and educational development). There is a need for an agreed definition of academic expertise that includes teaching research, managerial and administrative roles, with the implication that such a definition should attempt to address the imbalance between teaching and research. This professionalisation should be led by academic staff as a counter weight to managerialism and be broader than the exclusive focus on teaching evident in the ILTHE.

A set of prescriptions are then presented with implications for SD being drawn out for each. A case is made for categorisation as a way of providing identity and coherence providing it is on an inclusive basis that goes beyond the PhD. A particular role for staff development is in relation to contract, part-time and casual staff. The chapter argues that a broad ethical code ought to be possible to agree. Further, it is argued that very general statements of expertise in each part of the academic role ought to be achievable although the ILTHE draft competences are probably a step too far.

Continuing professional development is seen as an important part of career development and review and an obvious role for staff development. Boyer is cited as a way of addressing apparent fragmentation of the academic role in the context of a need to ensure a balance amongst the various elements. The growth of formal, accredited staff development and the possibilities of mentoring, coaching and work shadowing an action learning sense are noted (p27). In conclusion the article states that "professionalisation of academic work offers a means of protecting much that is valuable in a higher education institution and that distinguishes it from any other organisation. It also offers a means of bridging the apparent divide between senior managers and the departmentally based academic heartlands, since it is a way of improving working effectiveness that has the potential to gain wide support from amongst the academic community" (p28).

Evidence Based and Methodology

The paper quotes extensively from surveys of academic staff in Australia, UK and America and makes considerable references to the literature. Based on this, it advances an argument for the academic community to develop a notion of its own professionalism as a way of both promoting effectiveness and protecting itself from more managerially driven notions (of profession, effectiveness, competences and the like). It is predominantly desk research combined with insights from the authors own professional practice.

16. "Developing the Subject Dimension to Staff Development" in Blackwell, R and Blackmore, P (2003) **Towards Strategic Staff Development in Higher Education** (With Cliff Allan and Graham Gibbs)

Main Argument

This chapter argues that discipline or subject based projects have shown considerable potential for developing staff and overcoming discipline based hostility to generic staff development. The paper invokes the work of Becher and Henkle to explain this in terms of the disciplinary identity of academic staff and the social cohesion of their disciplines that characterise higher education. It asserts that issues of sustainability, how to continue the impact of projects after funding has ceased, and knowledge management have stimulated the development of a specific organisation (the LTSN) to pursue this agenda in the UK.

The analysis identifies four main opportunities and challenges for discipline based staff development: reinventing the wheel (the knowledge management issue); building communities of practice in unpromising conditions (drawing on the work of Becher) it argues that some areas of hard knowledge converge around common norms (mathematics and physics for example) are particularly difficult and need a sustained effort; the need to work with national policy mandates (which gave rise to the central parts of the LTSN, the generic centre and its executive involving "an experiment in loose – tight coupling" and the merging of top down and bottom up impulses (p75)); and finally an institutional focus, how institutional needs, strategies, lists of transferable skills etc are aligned with discipline or subject based equivalents supported and perhaps promoted by Subject Centres. The tripartite model of provision for part-time teachers is noted as a successful example; conflicting views about competencies or lists of transferable skills identified as a example of a problem; and questions of departmental restructuring and merger as institutions recast their subject mix "the (Subject) Centre's own strategies must be sensitive to such institutional needs and facilitate change rather than simply protect traditional disciplinary interests" (p76). The LTSN Languages, Linguistics and Area Studies Centre work on language teaching and the response to declining student demand is quoted as an example of how such a change agent role working with institutions may be developed. Finally, the issue of integrating discipline specific material into generic staff development programmes for new teachers, in which often the ability to mix across disciplines is one of the most valued parts of the programmes, nonetheless is noted as an area of potential requiring both sides to "clarify the relationships between their respective provision, to agree credit transfer arrangements and so on to ensure integrated and accredited programmes" (p77). The paper closes by noting that whilst there are likely to be some tensions between generic institutionally based staff development and disciplinary equivalents "the benefits of collaboration and the potential for synergy are great" (p77).

Evidence Base and Methodology

The paper contains five pages on FDTL and uses 4 case studies of FDTL projects (in Chemistry, Languages, Geography and History) as a springboard for discussing the issues that arise from discipline-based project funding and LTSN. That discussion, quotes extensively from the work of the LTSN generic centre and a number of subject centres. It is apparent from the text that the authors are drawing on considerable knowledge of both FDTL (Graham Gibbs was a member of the coordination team set

up by HEFCE) and the LTSN (Allan and Blackwell both working for the latter). These connections are acknowledged in the biographical notes of authors. Examples are quoted extensively.

Category Three: Published Conference Papers and Professional Magazine Articles

17. "In Pursuit of the feel equal factor?" People Management Vol.2 No.12 June 1996 36-7

This paper marshals the arguments developed about mentoring from previous papers and presents them to the members of the main professional body advocating traditional, hierarchical mentoring, then the Institute of Personnel Management now Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development. It draws on evidence from the health service as well as HE for this purpose.

The main challenge is to hierarchy and assumptions of one way learning 'at the master's feet'. The piece advocates peer learning, embedded in cultures of the workplace, based on mutuality. In relation to formality, it points to evidence of much generally valued extant but informal learning and advises 'if it ain't broke don't fix it'.

18. "IT Staff Training in the UK". 21st IUT Conference proceedings, Brazil (1997) pp 455-66

Main argument

Looking at the changing responsibilities for IT training, the paper argues that there is some evidence of new structural arrangements in the more divided old universities bringing together previously competing groups (in computing centres, libraries and SD units). It argues for new alliances with these providers in the basic skills area and points to new opportunities derived from the application IT to Teaching and Learning through Computer Assisted Learning (CAL) and the increased usage for university administration (such as finance) increasingly driven by senior management strategy. The former calls for a new alliance with technical specialists on CAL development and academic staff that goes beyond existing recipes (basic skills training plus awareness raising). It needs to include consultancy type support for cultural change, designed to pave the way for curriculum change (which it is argued is not addressed by the basic skills plus awareness-raising approach), as well as possible direct involvement in curriculum change (an area of SD expertise). Integration with policy drivers involves bringing together and responding to top down drivers and bottom up staff concerns. There is also the challenge of personal engagement and utilising CAL packages for SD.

In reviewing adoption strategies in addition to basic skills type training, it draws attention to the discipline based, project consortia route designed to gain ownership and address NIH; and bottom up personal strategies utilising key individuals (e.g. Humanities at Keele).

The conclusion highlights 4 tasks for SD:

- To maintain and develop personal competence
- To negotiate sensible working relationships with partners, including the emerging IT services organisations (merger of library and IT services in computer centres)
- To extend activities from basic skills to change oriented SD which complements the work of those pursuing other adoption strategies for CAL.
- To accommodate and integrate top down policy change concerned partly with efficiency in administrative areas with bottom up initiative.

Evidence base and methodology

It discusses examples from the English Midlands and acknowledges input and information from colleagues at 7 HEIs. This is discussed especially in relation to the re-structuring of responsibilities. This is placed in the context of Goslings national survey (1994) which shows limited engagement with IT and technology and the limited roles of UCOSDA and SEDA. There is a combination of documentary sources and empirical case studies.

Endnote

CAL was of course superseded by web applications and this was written just before this major technological development occurred although much of the argument for collaboration and new forms of development remains valid for web-based courseware.

Main argument

This paper argues that the creation of the HE Academy which is both a logical next step in the development of enhancement strategy around TQEF, and potentially a step change in coherence and structural togetherness. It sees the bringing together of the subject, institutional and individual strands within the HE Academy increasing the potential for synergy and serendipity through enhanced interactions between top down policy agendas, middle out feedback of departments in subjects and bottom up voice of staff. It sees the greatest potential for synergy as being at the level of the academic unit. The ability of departments to make sense of the various potential resources open to them and engage positively with selective change initiatives, and to develop appropriate cultures able to routinely and positively process change initiatives, is seen as crucial.

Key points

The paper recognizes that whilst the various cross cutting and overlapping impulses, create potential for new unpredictable solutions and perspectives, they are also likely to bring some tensions. Tensions noted, for example, between subject specific skills preferences and institutions approaches to skills, perhaps more influenced by employability agendas. Some tolerance will be necessary by subject centres of institutional priorities and constraints (including funding) and by institutions of subject centres articulation of bottom up and middle out feedback, encouraging double loop learning, if somewhat awkward and tricky at times. It argues that the prospects for greatest synergy and serendipity will be retarded should the bottom up voice of subject base practitioners be lost. Whilst noting that the individual membership base of the ILTHE and the role of the subject centres within LTSN in articulating sentiment upwards provide some scope for optimism, commenting that 'success in managing the tensions between these different impulses will have a significant bearing on development of the academy particularly as governments may be tempted to view it as a convenient policy delivery mechanism along the transmission belt model. Failure to engender a sense of ownership amongst academic staff could condemn the academy to superficial fiddling with quantitative indicators around the margins of academic cultures' (p11). Throughout, however, discussion, dialogue and collaboration are emphasized for ensuring positive interactions and development of the HE Academy is seen in optimistic terms... 'there is potential to build a really significant UK wide enhancement community beyond anything achieved hitherto' (p11).

Evidence base and Methodologies

The paper draws heavily on examples from the LTSN, the LTSN evaluation report and on three publications by Gibbs and his collaborators. It combines desk research with the professional knowledge of the author.